INDEX

Of

WITNESSES

Defense' Witnesses	Page
YAMAMOTO, Kumaichi (resumed)	26064
Direct by Mr. Blakeney (cont'd) Direct by Dr. KIOYSE	26064 26115 26118 26118 26123
Cross by Mr. Tavenner	26124
NOON RECESS	26132
Cross (cont'd) by Mr. Tavenner Cross by Mr. Brannon	2 6 133 2 6 152
AFTERNOON RECESS	26155
Cross by Mr. USAMI	26163
(Witness excused)	26165
KASE, Toshikazu	26166
Direct by Mr. Blakeney	26166
Cross by Mr. Tavenner	26175
(Witness excused)	26179
	26179
MATSUDAIRA, Yasumasa	26179
Direct by Mr. Blakeney (witness excused)	26181

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

Doc.	Def.	Pros.	Description	For Ident.	In Evidence
1401-I-3	2952		Report of Ambassador NOMURA to TOGO of Conversation Betwe NOMURA, KURUSU and Secretary of State Hul! on 26 November 1941		26065
206 - H	2953		Excerpt from "Ten Years in Japan" by Joseph C. Grew, U. Ambassador to Japa 1932-1942	S.	26069
1886	2954		The Explanation of the Premier at the Imperial Conference 1 December 1941	and the second	26072
1892	2955		The Explanation of the Foreign Minister at the Imperial Conference on 1 December	r-	26074
1401-C-2	2956		Telegram from TOGO Ambassador NOMURA dated 4 November		26098
1401-0-3	2957		Telegram from TOGO Ambassador NOMURA dated 3 November		26100
478-B	2958		Excerpt from "Speech by British Leader September, 1939 - ember 10, 1941 (V.	Nov-	26103
1401-Z-1	2959		Telegram from Ambas NOMURA to TOGO, d 24 October 1941	sador ated	26109
			MORNING RECESS		26109

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

(cont'd)

No.	Def.	Pros.	Description	For Ident	In Evidence
2063	2960		Affidavit of KASE, Toshikazu		26167
1401-F-3	2961		Telegram from TOGO t Ambassador NOMURA dated 7 December	1941	26168
1401-E-3	2962		Telegram from Ambass NOMURA to TOGO, 6 6 December 1941	ador	26169
1030	2963		Affidavit of MATSUDA Yasumasa	IRA,	26180

Monday, 18 August 1947

3

INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building Tokyo, Japan

7

The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, at 0930.

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

Appearances:

For the Tribunal, all Members sitting, with the exception of: HONORABLE JUSTICE STUART McDOUGALL, Member from the Dominion of Canada and HONORABLE JUSTICE I. M. ZARAYANOV, Member from the USSR., not sitting from 0930 to 1600.

> For the Prosecution Section, same as before. For the Defense Section, same as before.

20

21

22

23

(English to Japanese and Japanese to English interpretation was made by the Language Section, IMTFE.)

24

Knapp & Yelde

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

KUMAICHI YAMAMOTO, resumed the stand and testified, through Japanese interpreters, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: If the Tribunal please, there was a part of an exhibit omitted from the Japanese copy last Friday which is now supplied in translation, and ready for reading. That is exhibit 2935. I therefore suggest that it be read before we proceed.

The reading of the affidavit had progressed to page 10, the second paragraph of section 19, where I now resume:

Ambassadors NOMURA and KURUSU a telegram (Exhibit 2249) suggesting as their opinion that the relations between the two countries could be impreved by an exchange of telegrams between the President and the Emperor, the exchange to be followed by a proposal from Japan for establishment of a neutralized area. The ambassadors requested that the Foreign Minister consult concerning their

suggestion with the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal, and give them a prompt answer. Foreign Minister TOGO did consult not only with Lord Keeper KIDO, but also with Premier TOJO, and instructed me to convey to the ambassadors the result, that all three of them considered the project to offer no hope of settlement in the circumstances of the time, and that it would therefore be improper to adopt it. This information was conveyed to the ambassadors (Exhibit 1193). It should, however, be noted that although the ambassadors had sent their suggestion on 26 November, before receipt of the United States note of that date, Foreign Minister TOGO had, before his consultation with the Premier and the Lord Keeper, received from the ambassadors an outline of the American note, from which it appeared that successful conclusion of the negotiations had become almost impossible, and that such a scheme as that proposed by the ambassadors would be unavailing, defense document No. 1401-I-3, which is offered in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1401-I-3 will receive exhibit No. 2952. (Whereupon, the document above

25

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

referred to was marked defense Exhibit No. 2952 and received in evidence.)

MR. BLAKENEY: I read the exhibit, which is a telegram from NOMURA to TOGO, 26 November 1941:

"Ambassador KURUSU and I talked with Secretary Hull for about two hours from 4:45 P.M. on the 26th.

"Hull stated that the United States for several days had thoroughly examined the modus vivendi proposed by Japan on the 20th of this month (Proposal 'B'), and had fully consulted about it with the countries concerned, but that unfortunately she could not agree to it, and that she was constrained to propose instead a plan (marked 'tentative and without commitment') which was a compromise between the American proposal of 21 June and the Japanese proposal of 25 September. The gist of the plan is as follows:

- "(A) Request of approval of the four principles.
- "(B) 1. Conclusion of a multilateral non-aggression pact among the British Empire, China, Japan, the Netherlands, the Soviet Union, Thailand and the United States.
- "2. Conclusion of an agreement among the United States, the British Empire, China, Japan,

2

4

5

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

16

17 18

...

19 20

21

22 23

24

1	th
	ag
2	ec
3	-
4	
5	fı
6	
7	a
8	t
9	
10	r
11	
12	. 8
13	1
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	3
19)
20	0
2	1
2	- 1
2	3

the Netherlands and Thailand concerns	ng	HOH-
aggression toward French Indo-China	and	equal
aggression condition		
economic treatment therein.		

"3. Withdrawal of all Japanese forces from China and French Indo-China.

"4. Assurance that the United States and Japan will not support any regime in China other than the Chiang Kai-shek regime.

"5. Abolition of extraterritorial rights and concessions in China.

"6. Conclusion of a reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Japan on the basis of the most-favored-nation principle.

"7. Reciprocal rescission of the freezing of assets.

"8. Stabilization of the dollar-yen

which either has concluded with any third powers shall be interpreted by it in such a way as to conflict with the purpose of this agreement and preservation of peace in the Pacific area (a proposal to make the Tripartite Pact a dead letter).

"We argued strongly against the proposal, saying that it is in conflict with what has been

discussed so far and that we were reluctant to make report of it to Tokyo. However, Hull showed to sign of concession.

"It is presumed that the United States proposed such a strong plan as a result of the victory of the strong elements in the country over the supporters of compromise, because of our request to suspend American aid to Chinng, speeches of our leaders against Britain and America and the rumor that Japan requested Thailand to hand over the entire defense of the latter country, as well as under the influence of British, Dutch and Chinese pressure."

"20." -- From the affidavit:

"The ambassadors at Washington had sent frequent telegrams to the Foreign Ministry pointing out the harmful effect upon the Japanese-American negotiations of anti-American articles in Japanese newspapers, and Foreign Minister TOGO was concerned over it. He accordingly endeavored to prevent the appearance of such injurious publications, hoping thereby to further the negotiations. The instance of such control appearing in the Foreign Minister's telegram of 1 December (Exhibit 1208) was by no means the first; much earlier, for example, Ambassador Grew

had complained of the 'Japan Times' as being particularly offensive, and the Foreign Minister had taken prompt and drastic measures against it (defense document No. 206-H)" which is offered in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 206-H

will receive exhibit No. 2953.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2953 and received in evidence.)

MR. BLAKENEY: I read the exhibit, which is an "Excerpt from 'Ten Years in Japan,' by Joseph C. Grew, United States Ambassador to Japan 1932-1942.

"November 7, 1941. -- At the Soviet Embassy reception today, to celebrate their national holiday (they are the only diplomatic mission which now holds such receptions), I took occasion to make the strongest representations to every Japanese to whom I talked with regard to the 'Times and Advertiser' editorial, mentioned above, listing seven points as a program for American 'restitution' to Japan, and to point out what serious harm the editorial had done, especially at the moment of sending KURUSU to the United States to try to bring the current conversations to a successful conclusion. I spoke of

the utter stupidity of creating such a hostile atmosphere here and such an unfortunate impression on the American public at a moment when constructive, not destructive, results were desired. I made it clear that it was not my intention to presume to interfere with the Japanese press but only to point out factually the inevitable effects in my country when such editorials, assumed to represent the views of the Japanese Government since the 'Times and Advertiser' is known to be controlled by the Foreign Office, were reprinted in the United States.

"TOGO, the Foreign Minister, appeared to know nothing about the editorial and was sure that it had not been inspired by the Foreign Office, but he undertook to look into it and a few moments later he called Toshi GO, editor of the paper, over to him and told him what I had said. I also spoke to Toshi GO, who said that he alone was responsible for the editorial and had written it himself as indicating Japan's maximum demands which would undoubtedly be far beyond what the Government would ask for in the conversations. I told him that he could have no conception of the harm that he had done. Somebody else told me that GO had published the editorial as a protest against the secrecy under

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

which the conversations were being held.

"SHIGEMITSU, with whom I talked, was thoroughly sympathetic and said that he would do his best to stop this sort of thing, while MATSUMOTO, head of Domei, promised me that there would be an immediate change in the tone and substance of the Japanese press, and he was as good as his word because the tone did immediately change for the better. I think I succeeded in stirring them all up considerably, so the gathering at the Soviet party was distinctly useful.

"The next time I called on TOGO I repeated these representations and he replied that while the Foreign Office had exerted no control over the 'Times and Advertiser' up to the present, it was jolly well going to exert such control from now on. The editorial may or may not have been dictated by the Foreign Office, regardless of what Toshi GO said. One informant said that it had been so dictated, but if so, I think it was probably done by some subordinate official and without the knowledge of the Minister, who, I am convinced, knew nothing about it."

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22 23

24 25

Returning to the affidavit: "The Notification Closing Negotiations.

"21. The commencement of hostilities was decided upon on 1 December, through an extraordinary Cabinet meeting in the morning and an Imperial Conference in the afternoon (exhibit 588). At the Imperial Conference, explanations were given by the Premier and the Foreign Minister of the circumstances, those explanations being respectively defense documents 1886 and 1892," the first of which, document 1886, I offer in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document No. 1886 will receive exhibit No. 2954.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2954 and received in evidence.)

MR. BLAKENEY: I read the exhibit: "The Explanation of the Premier at the Imperial Conference on 1 December.

"By the Imperial permission, I will sponsor the proceedings of the Conference.

"In accordance with the decision of the Imperial Conference of 5 November, the Government has taken all possible steps, concentrating all its

energies, to adjust the relations with the United States, while the Imperial Army and Navy have made efforts to complete their preparations for operations. The United States, however, has not shown any sign of concession from its past position. Moreover, she served, jointly with Britain, the Netherlands and China, new demands such as the unconditional over-all withdrawal of Japanese troops, the withdrawal of recognition of the Nanking Government, and the nullification of the Tripartite Pact, proposing unilateral concessions by Japan. Should Japan submit to her demands, not only would Japan's prestige be entirely destroyed and the solution of the China Affair rendered impossible, but Japan's existence itself would be endangered. It is now clear that Japan's claims cannot be attained through diplomatic measures. Meanwhile, the United States, Britain, the Netherlands and China have increasingly strengthened their economic and military pressure upon Japan. From the viewpoints both of Japan's national power and of strategy, it is now utterly impossible for Japan to permit the present situation to continue any longer. In such circumstances, Japan now has no other way than to wage war against the United States, Britain and the Netherlands in order

to achieve a solution of the present critical

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

situation and to secure its existence and self-defense.

"We are filled with trepidation to think that it causes much anxiety to His Imperial Majesty to plunge into a great war at the present moment when the China Affair has already lasted for four years. Upon careful consideration, however, it is my belief that our national power is now several times as strong as before the outbreak of the China Affair, that our national solidarity is all the more tightened, and that the morale of the Imperial Army and Navy is exceedingly high. I am convinced that the whole nation, presenting a united front and laying down their lives for the sake of the country, will surely deliver us from the present national crisis. I hope that you will give due deliberation to the subject placed before you. Concerning matters of diplomatic negotiations and military operations, explanation will be given by the Cabinet ministers concerned and the High Command."

I now offer in evidence defense document No. 1892.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document No. 1892 will receive exhibit No. 2955.

(Whereupon, the document above

10

11

12

16

17

19

20

21

22

4

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2955 and received in evidence.)

MR. BLAKENEY: I read the exhibit which is "The Explanation of the Foreign Minister at the Imperial Conference on 1 December 1941.

"Explanations will be made today chiefly on the development of the Japanese-American negotiations after the Imperial Conference of 5 November. To summarize the circumstances of the negotiations before that Conference, that is to say to about the end of October, the United States had insisted on the following four principles as the basis of international relations; namely:

- "(1) Respect for the territorial integrity and the sovereignty of each and every nation;
- "(2) Non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries.
 - "(3) Non-discriminatory treatment in trade;
- "(4) Non-disturbance of the status quo in the Pacific except as the status quo may be altered by peaceful means. The United States insisted on the application of these principles; expressed doubt as to the peaceful intention of Japan; raised objections to the stationing of

Japanese troops in China; insisted that the principle

7 8

of non-discrimination in international trade be applied unconditionally in China; and demanded that the Tripartite Pact be rendered in effect a dead letter. The negotiations, thus faced with difficulties, at last came to an impasse.

"Such divergence of views between the two countries has resulted largely from the fact that the United States Government obstinately adhered to the doctrinarian principles to which it had traditionally submitted, and insisted on their unconditional application to China and other areas, regardless of the actual situation prevailing in East Asia. It was evident that, so long as the United States refused to alter such an attitude, the conclusion of the present negotiations was extremely difficult.

"The present Cabinet considered it proper to bring about the adjustment of Japanese-American relations on an equitable basis, and decided to make all possible concessions and to concentrate its energies to avert a rupture between Japan and the United States. From this viewpoint, our previous proposal of 25 September was moderated with respect to the following three questions which had so far been the main points at issue in the Japanese-American negotiations; namely, (1) the interpretation of the

3

5

0

.

.

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

22

24

right of self-defense in connection with the Tripartite Pact, (2) the principle of non-discrimination in international trade, and (3) the withdrawal of Japanese troops from China and French Indo-China. (1) With respect to the problem of the right of selfdefense in connection with the Tripartite Pact, we proposed that the United States should declare that she would not make any unwarranted extension of the interpretation of the right of self-defense, and that, at the same time, Japan also should make a similar declaration. (2) With respect to the principle of non-discrimination, Japan should recognize it to be applied to China on the understanding that the principle was to be applied uniformly to the rest of the world. (3) With regard to the withdrawal of Japanese troops, it was provided that the Japanese troops dispatched to China in connection with the China Affair would be withdrawn within two years following the restoration of peace between Japan and China in accordance with the agreement to be entered into between Japan and China, except those in specified areas in North China and Mengchiang, as well as Hainan Island, which would be stationed for such period as may be necessary. In regard to French Indo-China, it was revised to stipulate that Japan respects the

territorial integrity of French Indo-China, and that the Japanese troops dispatched thereto will be withdrawn immediately upon either the settlement of the China Affair or the establishment of peace in East Asia on an equitable basis. The Imperial Confer-

ence of 5 November decided upon the above.

"In accordance with the decision, the Government instructed Ambassador NOMURA to convey to the United States that Japanese-American relations, which were on the verge of collapse, could be saved in the pressing circumstances only through the consummation of the negotiations on the basis of the present proposal, and that it was earnestly desired that the United States should, in view of the greatest possible concessions which the Japanese Government had made in spite of every difficulty, sincerely reconsider the situation and cooperate with Japan for the sake of the peace of the Pacific. The negotiations were continued in Washington thereafter; but meanwhile I had frequent conversations in Tokyo with the American and British Ambassadors with a view to urging the negotiations. Ambassador NOMURA, beginning with the interview with Secretary of State Hull on the 7th, met President Roosevelt on the 10th, and Secretary Hull on the 12th and the 15th, earnestly endeavoring to promote the

10

11

12

13

24

23

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

negotiations. Meanwhile, in consideration of the serious situation, the Japanese Government on the 5th dispatched Ambassador KURUSU to the United States with a view to exhausting every possible diplomatic effort. He arrived at Washington on the 15th, and, assisting Ambassador NOMURA, participated in the negotiations after the 17th. The negotiations were then already in full swing. From the 7th onward, the United States was putting questions about various points as if to sound the true intention of Japan. The United States, who had insisted on the overthrow of Hitlerism, demanded that Japan should give up the policy of force. She seemed to be still apprehensive of the policy of Japan in connection with the Tripartite Pact, and requested that Japan should reaffirm her peaceful intentions, as stated in the aforementioned statement of the Japanese Government on 28 August. Moreover, she repeatedly urged that there would be no need for Japan to maintain the Tripartite Pact after the consummation of a Japanese-American agreement, and expressed her desire that that treaty should cease to exist or become a dead letter. As regards the principle of non-discrimination in international trade, the United States desired to drop the condition which we proposed, that the principle be applied uniformly to the whole world, urging that she had

2

striven for the restoration of freedom of trade. At the same time, the United States proposed separately 'the Joint Declaration on Economic Policy', and suggested that the countries should cooperate in restoring free trade in the whole world; that the normal commercial relations between the two countries be restored through conclusion of a Japanese-American commercial agreement; that, as to China, complete control over her economic, financial and monetary affairs should be restored to her; and that a comprehensive program of economic development should be inaugurated in China under international cooperation. With regard to the withdrawal of Japanese troops from China, the United States made no special argument, but only showed disapproval of the permanent or indefinite stationing of them. It proposed, however, to employ good offices for direct negotiations between Japan and China, provided Japan would adopt a peaceful policy.

"The Japanese Government replied that our proposal of 25 September comprehended all the points which the United States desired Japan to confirm in connection with its statement of peaceful intentions of 28 August, and that the present Cabinet naturally had no objection to confirming them. With respect to

4

7

9

10

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23

the qualification of the principle of nondiscrimination, an answer was made that Japan desired its application throughout the world, and that it would recognize the application of the principle to China depending upon the realization of that desire. And with respect to the American proposal for the joint international development of China, the Japanese Government replied that it was unacceptable to Japan as it disregarded the actual state of affairs in China and would open the way for the joint international control of that country. It was also replied that Japan had no objection to the American good offices for peace between Japan and China. It was at this stage that Ambassador KURUSU joined in the negotiations. Ambassadors NOMURA and KURUSU met President Roosevelt on the 17th, and had interviews with Secretary Hull on the 18th, the 20th, the 21st, the 22d and the 26th. In the interviews of the 17th and the 18th, however, the President stated that he desired peace between Japan and the United States, and that he had no intention either to intervene or to mediate between Japan and China, but wanted only to be an 'introducer' between them. On the other hand, the Secretary of State emphasized that the Japanese-American negotiations

25

would prove difficult as long as Japan cooperated with Germany, and dwelt upon the necessity of removing that fundamental difficulty. After exhaustive discussions it became clear that the difficulty lay as before in the questions of the Tripartite Pact, the principle of non-discrimination, and China. Thereupon, the Japanese Government presented on the 20th a new proposal which simplified the previous proposal full of propagandistic tone, on the basis of which the negotiations had so far been conducted; eliminated the question of the principle of non-discrimination, upon which an agreement was not readily to be attained, and also that of the Tripartite Pact, which was left to a future proposal to be made by the United States; and requested the United States simply to refrain from disturbing the peace between Japan and China with a view to leaving the China problem to direct negotiation between Japan and China. The contents of the proposal were as follows:

"1. Both the Governments of Japan and the United States undertake not to make any armed advancement into any of the regions, excepting French Indo-China, in the South Eastern Asia and the Southern Pacific area.

"2. The Governments of Japan and the United

. 3

4

5

7 8

9

11 12

13

14

16

3

18

20

22 23

25

24

States shall cooperate with a view to securing the acquisition of those goods and commodities which the two countries need in the Netherlands East Indies.

"3. The Governments of Japan and the United States mutually undertake to restore their commercial relations to those prevailing prior to the freezing of the assets. The Government of the United States shall supply Japan a required quantity of oil.

"4. The Government of the United States undertakes not to indulge in measures and actions prejudicial to the endeavors for the restoration of general peace between Japan and China.

withdraw troops now stationed in French Indo-China upon either the restoration of peace between Japan and China or the establishment of an equitable peace in the Pacific area.

"The Government of Japan declares that it
is prepared to remove the Japanese troops now stationed
in the southern part of French Indo-China to the
northern part of the said territory upon the conclusion
of the present agreement.

"Regarding the above proposal, the United States contended that it was impossible to cease aiding the Chiang Kai-shek regime unless Japan clarified her relations with the Tripartite Pact and gave assurance regarding her adoption of a peaceful policy, and that the President's offer of being an 'introducer' presupposed Japan's adoption of a peaceful policy. Thereupon, we requested reconsideration of the United States, pointing out that it was self-contradictory that the United States should, after the commencement of the Japanese-Chinese direct negotiations through the introduction of the President as proposed by the United States, continue aid to the Chiang Kai-shek regime, thereby interfering with the peace between the two countries, the United States being an intermediary of peace. Nevertheless, the United States failed to show any sign of concession, refusing to give up aid to the Chiang Kai-shek regime and repeating her assertions concerning the Tripartite Pact, although she stated that she had no objection to Japan's and the United States' holding leadership in East Asia and in the Western Hemisphere respectively, and that she desired the amicable conclusion of the Pacific agreement.

2

3

5

7

9

10

11

12

14

"Meanwhile, the United States Government consulted with the representatives of Britain, Australia, the Netherlands and Chungking, and Secretary Hull stated on the 22nd that the above Powers, though they considered it possible to restore the normal relations of international trade if Japan's adoption of a peaceful policy was ascertained, seemed to intend to realize it gradually, and that the withdrawal of troops from southern French Indo-China alone would not be enough, according to their opinions, to ease the tense situation in the Southern Pacific. He further revealed that he considered the time not yet ripe for the President's acting as 'go-between' of peace between Japan and China.

"The United States Government continued consultations with the representatives of the Powers above referred to, and Secretary Hull told our two ambassadors on the 26th that, although the United States had carefully studied the Japanese proposal of the 20th and had consulted with the countries concerned, she could not unfortunately agree to our proposal, and presented the following new proposals as being a compromise plan between the American June proposal and our September proposal. The first

24

proposal was a request for confirmation of the socalled Four Principles (item 4 thereof was altered to the principle of reliance upon international cooperation and conciliation for the prevention of controversies). It was proposed secondly as the basis for future negotiations that the two governments should undertake the following:

"1. The Government of the United States and the Government of Japan will endeavor to conclude a multilateral non-aggression pact among the British Empire, China, Japan, the Netherlands, the Soviet Union, Thailand and the United States.

"2. Both Governments will endeavor to conclude among the American, British, Chinese,
Japanese, the Netherlands and Thai Governments
an agreement whereunder each of the Governments
would pledge itself to respect the territorial
integrity of French Indo-China and, in the
event that there should develop a threat to the
territorial integrity of Indo-China, to enter
into immediate consultation with a view to
taking such measures as may be deemed necessary and advisable to meet the threat in question.

10

8

11

13

14

15 16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

"Such agreement would provide also that each of the Governments party to the agreement would not seek or accept preferential treatment in its trade or economic relations with Indo-China and would use its influence to obtain for each of the signatories equality of treatment in trade and commerce with French Indo-China.

26,088

"3. The Government of Japan will withdraw all military, naval, air and police forces from China and from Indo-China.

"4. The Government of the United States and the Government of Japan will not support -- militarily, politically, economically -- any government or regime in China other than the National Government of the Republic of China with capital temporarily at Chungking.

"5. Both Governments will give up all extraterritorial rights in China, including rights and interests in and with regard to international settlements and concessions, and rights under the Boxer Protocol of 1901.

"Both Governments will endeavor to obtain the agreement of the British and other Governments to give up extraterritorial rights in China, including rights in international settlements and concessions and under the Boxer Protocol of 1901.

"6. The Government of the United States and the Government of Japan will enter into negotiations for the conclusion between the United States and Japan of a trade agreement, based upon reciprocal most favored-nation treatment and reduction of trade barriers by both countries, including an undertaking

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22.

23

24 25 by the United States to bind raw silk on the free list.

"7. The Government of the United States and the Government of Japan will, respectively, remove the freezing restrictions on Japanese funds in the United States and on American funds in Japan.

"8. Both Governments will agree upon a plan for the stabilization of the dollar-yen rate, with the allocation of funds adequate for this purpose, half to be supplied by Japan and half by the United States.

"9. Both Governments will agree that no agreement which either has concluded with any third powers shall be interpreted by it in such a way as to conflict with the fundamental purpose of this agreement, the establishment and preservation of peace throughout the Pacific area.

"10. Both Governments will use their influence to cause other governments to adhere to and to give practical application to the basic political and economic principles set forth in this agreement.

"Regarding the above proposal, our Ambassadors pointed out its unreasonableness, and strongly contended against it, but Secretary Hull did not show any sign of concession, it was reported. On the

.

Ambassadors, told them that, although he still hoped for an amicable conclusion of the Japanese-American negotiations, he considered, on the basis of the latest information, that there was danger that cold water would be dashed upon the United States for the second time, just as had been done in last July by the advance of Japanese troops into the southern part of French Indo-China, and that it would be futile to try to surmount the crisis by a modus vivendi if the fundamental policies of the two countries were not in accord.

tained some acceptable items, such as those concerning international trade (Items VI, VII, VIII) and the abolition of extraterritorial rights in China (Item V) but the items concerning China and French Indo-China (Items II, III) the nonrecognition of the Nationalist Government of China (Item IV) the disapproval of the Tripartite Pact (Item IX) and the conclusion of a multilateral nonaggression pact (Item I) are all unacceptable for Japan. In fine, this proposal is unreasonable, constituting a marked retrogression from the previous proposals of the United States and entirely disregarding the course

of negotiations for over half a year.

"In short, the United States Government has persistently adhered to traditional ideas and principles, disregarded the actual situation in East Asia and tried to force Japan to act on those principles which the United States herself would not observe. Throughout the present negotiations, lasting for the past seven months, the United States has made no concessions from her original stand, in spite of the various concessions made frequently by Japan.

"It has been a consistent policy of the United States to obstruct Japan's efforts toward the establishment of the new order in East Asia, which constitutes our immutable national policy. If we accepted the present proposal of the United States, Japan would be in an international position inferior even to that which it had held before the outbreak of the Manchurian incident, and its very existence would also be endangered.

"1. China under the rules of Chiang Kaishek would become even more disposed to depend upon
Britain and the United States, and Japan would have
to break its faith with the National Government of
China. The friendly relations between Japan and

7 8

China would be ruined for years to come. Japan would be compelled to retreat completely from the continent; the status of Manchoukuo would accordingly be exposed to all dangers; and we would lose all means to carry through the China Affair.

"2. Britain and the United States would reign over these areas as leaders. Japan would entirely lose its authority as well as its position as the stabilizing power of East Asia, and the work of establishing the new order in East Asia would collapse midway.

"3. The Tripartite Pact would become a mere scrap of paper, and Japan would have to forfeit its national good faith.

"4. The design to restrain Japan by the organization of a collective machinery of Powers, with the Soviet Union as a new member, would increase the menace on our northern frontier.

"5. As to such principles as that of non-discrimination in trade, they are not necessarily to be excluded. However, it is only to carry through their selfish policy that Britain and the United States intend to apply these principles exclusively to the Pacific area, and Japan would have to face great difficulties in obtaining essential goods and

3

5

8

9

10 11

12 13

14

16

15

17 18

19

20 21

2:2

23

24

25

materials which she requires.

"All things considered, the above proposal is utterly unacceptable for Japan, and we cannot help recognizing that, unless the United States wholly withdraws it, it is almost impossible to realize fully our claim by continuing the negotiation further upon the basis of the present proposal."

Resuming the affidavit:

"With respect, however, to the date of and the procedure for commencement of hostilities, there was no discussion or decision on that day.

"The question of the procedure for opening hostilities first came up for discussion at the Liaison Conference of the following day, 2 December. On that occasion the Foreign Minister said that the government must follow the usual procedure and formalities for opening hostilities. Discussion followed, and the Foreign Minister finally said that it was essential that at the least a notification of termination of the negotiations be given prior to the initiation of hostilities. He referred, in this connection, to the telegram from Ambassador NOMURA to the same effect, defense document No. 1401-X-2," which is now exhibit 2949, and from which I read the unread portion:

"As the United States made this proposal after

suspension of the negotiations in the past. 1 resorting to free action without taking steps to 2 terminate the negotiations not only would be utilized for counter-propaganda against us, but would preju-4 dice the good faith of Japan as a world power. Such 5 steps, however, involve matters of military secrecy. It is considered advisable that the negotiations be 7 terminated, depending upon the decision of the Govern-8 ment, either by notification to the American Ambassador in Tokyo, by an open declaration, or by any other 10 means. In any case I should like to be informed in 11 advance so that I can give notification here simul-12 13 taneously. 14

"As I am seeing the President soon, I should like to be instructed immediately if there is anything which I should bear in mind."

Reverting to the affidavit:

"The conference adjourned on that day without arriving at any conclusion.

"It was at the Liaison Conference of 3

December that the result of further discussions was embodied in a decision concerning the procedure for opening war, the decision being that a notification closing the negotiations would be given at Washington. I had drafted the notification in accordance with the

23 24

25

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

having conferred with the countries concerned, in accordance with her long-standing position and because of our request to obtain their concurrence, we must maintain close vigilance regarding their intentions. On the other hand, we have, in accordance with your instructions, pressed them only for speedy conclusion of the negotiations, and have not, therefore, expressed anything in the nature of an ultimatum. Moreover, the situation is such that the President, at the meeting of the 17th, said that there can be 'no last word.' In such circumstances, if we resort to freedom of action after the time set without in some way terminating the present negotiations, it is very likely that the United States, taking advantage of the fact that she is at present conferring with the countries concerned, will make propaganda that Japan prolonged the negotiations with the aim only of gaining time for preparing for a definite course of action and launched on the planned action upon completion of the preparation even while the negotiations were still being carried on, thereby shifting to us the responsibility for the rupture of the negotiations. It should be recalled in this connection that the United States blamed our

advance into French Indo-China for the

22 23 24

25

resorting to free action without taking steps to terminate the negotiations not only would be utilized for counter-propaganda against us, but would prejudice the good faith of Japan as a world power. Such steps, however, involve matters of military secrecy. It is considered advisable that the negotiations be terminated, depending upon the decision of the Government, either by notification to the American Ambassador in Tokyo, by an open declaration, or by any other means. In any case I should like to be informed in advance so that I can give notification here simultaneously.

"As I am seeing the President soon, I should like to be instructed immediately if there is anything which I should bear in mind."

Reverting to the affidavit:

"The conference adjourned on that day without arriving at any conclusion.

"It was at the Liaison Conference of 3

December that the result of further discussions was embodied in a decision concerning the procedure for opening war, the decision being that a notification closing the negotiations would be given at Washington. I had drafted the notification in accordance with the

decisions of various Liaison Conferences; my draft had been submitted to the Army and Navy Ministries, who made some suggestions and changes, and it was then brought to the Liaison Conference of 4 December and copies submitted to the participants, and in its final form was approved by the Conference (exhibit 1245-K). The Foreign Minister told me later that he had also reported the gist of it to the Cabinet meeting of 5 December. It was the belief and conclusion of the participants in the Liaison Conference that the intention not only of breaking off the negotiations but of severing relations and going to war was, in the circumstances then prevailing, clearly expressed in the concluding words of the document: 'Thus, the earnest hope of the Japanese Government to adjust Japanese-American relations and to preserve and promote the peace of the Pacific through cooperation with the American Government has finally been lost. The Japanese Government regrets to have to notify the American Government that in view of the attitude of the American Government it cannot but consider that it is impossible to reach an agreement through further negotiations.'

"22. At the Liaison Conference of 6 December the time for delivery of the notification to the

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

American Government was fixed. It was reported by
the Foreign Minister that the decision was to deliver
the notification at 1 P. M., Washington time, 7 December, which would be in advance of the commencement of
hostilities. No members of the Liaison Conference except
those concerned with military operations knew when or
where operations would commence; no one of the Foreign
Ministry knew, or knew that the fleet had sailed from
Hitokappu Bay on 26 November and was approaching
Hawaii, or was informed of any of the other strictly

"The Foreign Minister thereafter ordered me
to send the text of the notification ahead of time,
to insure its delivery at the time appointed, and
we arranged most carefully that it should reach the
embassy in Washington in ample time to be delivered
to the American Government without fail at 1 P. M. on
7 December. The time of dispatch being also a matter
of concern to the Navy, it was after consultation with
the Navy officials concerned that the earliest time
for dispatching the message was decided.

"23. Japan did not notify Britain in advance of the commencement of hostilities. The Foreign Minister had long been solicitous over Anglo-Japanese relations, and had repeatedly attempted to induce the

secret operational plans.

British Government to participate in the Washington negotiations. Ambassador NOMURA had been directed to urge the United States to take necessary steps to have 3 the British and Dutch Governments sign an agreement simultaneously with the United States, defense docu-5 ment No. 1401-C-2," which I offer in evidence. 6 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 7 CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 8 1401-C-2 will receive exhibit No. 2956. 9 (Whereupon, the document above 10 referred to was marked defense exhibit 11 No. 2956 and received in evidence.) 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22

23

24

2

3

4 5

6

8

9

11

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

25

MR. BLAKENEY: I read the exhibit, which is a telegram from TOGO to NOMURA, 4 November 1941.

"Reference to my telegram No. 725.

"As Britain is a de facto contracting party

to the present negotiations, and in view of the circumstances that she possesses extensive rights and interests in the Far East, it has to be noted that, when the proposed terms of understanding (this with respect to both Proposals 'A' and 'B') are to be carried into execution, not only Britain, but also the Netherlands, must be in a position to carry them out. Unless there is a definite guarantee on this point, Japan cannot rest assured by the mere fact of having reached an understanding with the United States Government. It is necessary that Britain and the Netherlands should simultaneously concur in the Japanese-American agreement with regard to the matters concerning those two countries. Accordingly, you are directed to approach the United States to have her take necessary steps in order to obtain from the two countries assurances of their concurrence in the agreement, and cable the results."

Returning to the affidavit:

"The Foreign Minister had discussed the matter personally with Ambassador Grew, in Tokyo

(defense document No. 1400-Z-6)," which is now exhibit No. 2918, and to which reference is made.

"He also requested Ambassador Craigie to have the British Government make a positive effort for the conclusion of the negotiations, informing him of the acute situation (defense document No. 1401-G-3)," which I offer in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document

1401-G-3 will receive exhibit No. 2957.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2957 and received in evidence.)

MR. BLAKENEY: The exhibit is a telegram from TOGO to NOMURA, dated the 3d of November, 1941.

"(1) On the occasion of my interview with
the Diplomatic Corps on 30 October, while having a
talk with the American Ambassador in Tokyo, I expressed
my regret over the recent aggravation of the tense
relations between Japan and the United States and
pointed out the danger that things might, if left
alone, have serious consequences. I called his attention to the fact that the Japanese nation had become
impatient with the slow progress of the negotiations
which had dragged on for six months and I expressed

my desire to bring them to a conclusion promptly, and requested further cooperation on the part of the American Ambassador. I emphasized that, in order to break the deadlock, the American Government also should consider some measures for the settlement of the matter fitting to the actual situation of the Far East, without clinging to theories.

"I referred, by way of explaining the complicated circumstances of the Far East, to the problem of the withdrawal of Japanese forces from China, pointing out that there were certain countries besides Japan whose forces were actually stationed in China, and also to the situation in Outer Mongolia where the Soviet Union had stationed forces of considerable strength in spite of the fact that China regarded it as a part of her territory, and requested that the American Government should recognize the real state of affairs there and fully understand the Japanese viewpoint. The American Ambassador listened to my opinion, promised to cooperate, and replied that it was desirable to proceed with the negotiations simultaneously in Tokyo and in Washington.

"(2) When the British Ambassador called on me for some other business on the 29th, I told him that the attitude of the United States tends to be so

4 5

doctrinarian and unrealistic that there is at present 2 little prospect of success of the negotiations, and the situation is one of deep concern; that should the negotiations end in failure the development of the situation would be unpredictable, and that inasmuch as such development would not be in the interest of Great Britain, who has important rights and interests in the Far East, it would be proper for her to strive at this moment for the improvement of Japanese-British-American relations and the maintenance of world peace. The Ambassador promised that he would immediately transmit the matter to his Government, and left. When I saw the Ambassador on the 30th I repeated to him to the same effect and impressed upon him that the situation is very acute and allows of no further procrastination.

> "Transmit to London." Returning to the affidavit:

"The British Ambassador, however, advised the Foreign Minister that his Government felt that it should entrust the negotiations to the United States Government for the time being (exhibit 1174). Meanwhile, repeated telegrams of Ambassador NOMURA reported that the United States Government was carrying on careful consultation, through their representatives

18 19

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

20 21

22

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

in Washington, with the Governments of Britain, the Netherlands and China (exhibit 1184, defense document No. 1401-V-2)" which is exhibit No. 2948. "At that time it was considered by the Japanese circles concerned that the British Government's attitude toward the Japanese-American negotiations -- which had close connection with the important British interests in East Asia -- was one of the proofs that America and Great Britain were adopting a united front against Japan in East Asia, as they were in respect also of the European war. It was also taken into consideration that Prime Minister Churchill had on 10 November already in effect committed Great Britain to going to war with Japan automatically upon an outbreak of hostilities between the United States and Japan (defense document No. 478-B)," which is offered in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 478-B will receive exhibit No. 2958.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2958 and received in evidence.)

MR. BLAKENEY: The prosecution advises me that they believe this speech to have been placed in

24

evidence by the prosecution.

THE PRESIDENT: We have read it somewhere in the evidence.

MR. BLAKENEY: But Mr. Comyns Carr is not sure whether the precise excerpts have been placed in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: It is a familiar statement.

MR. BLAKENEY: I suggest if it is in evidence I be permitted to read these excerpts.

THE PRESIDENT: We notice at the top, "Exhibit No. 2324." What is that?

MR. TAVENNER: That is the point we desire to call to the Tribunal's attention, and we thought it meant that it was an exhibit formerly introduced.

THE PRESIDENT: 2324 is tendered for identification only.

MR. BLAKENEY: I seem to remember tendering this book for identification on a different matter. I do not think it included this feature in any way.

May I read the exhibit?

THE PRESIDENT: Our familiarity with this does not mean it is already in evidence, because we cannot help knowing these things. We read them before we came to Japan.

A colleague tells me that the first part

8

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

20

21

23

24

3

4

5

7

9

10

11

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

21

22

24

appears in telegrams between New York and Tokyo; that the second part is new as far as the evidence goes. Perhaps you had better tender the lot and save time.

Admitted on the usual terms.

MR. BLAKENEY: I read the exhibit, which is an excerpt fromm a speech by Winston Churchill appearing in "Speeches by British Leaders."

"The United States' time-honored interests in the Far East are well known. They are doing their utmost to find a way of preserving peace in the Pacific. We do not know whether their efforts will be successful, but if they fail, I take this occasion to say -- and it is my duty to say -- that should the United States become involved in war with Japan the British declaration will follow within the hour.

"...I hope devoutly that the peace of the Pacific will be preserved in accordance with the known wishes of the wisest statesmen of Japan, but every preparation to defend British interests in the Far East and to defend the common cause now at stake has been, and is being, made."

Returning to the affidavit:

"In such circumstances it was considered by the Liaison Conference that as a matter of course the

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Government of the United States would notify that of Great Britain immediately upon receipt of the notification of termination of negotiations, and that the delivery of a notice additionally to Great Britain was unnecessary.

"Consular Reports of Shipping.

"24. Consuls stationed abroad had the duty of reporting, from time to time, such information concerning the politics, economy, finance, military affairs and other matters of interest pertaining to the places where they were stationed as they considered of interest to the Japanese Government. With respect to such affairs, other government offices frequently requested the use of the organization and facilities of the Foreign Ministry for investigations which they desired to conduct; when such requests were received, the Foreign Ministry dealt with them as routine business, instructions from the appropriate bureau or section going to the consuls to make the required investigations and report. These instructions, like all instructions to consuls, ministers and ambassadors, were always issued in the name of the Foreign Minister; but in actuality, not being Foreign Ministry business, they were never seen by the Foreign Minister, but were sent round to the Cable Section

4

24

3

4

6

7 8

9

10

12

13

14

16

17

18

20

21

23 24

25

for dispatch with the approval of the chief of the appropriate Aureau or section, or even at times of a competent secretary.

"It was in accordance with this system, which had prevailed for many years, that at the request of the Navy in 1941 consular reports on merchant and naval shipping of the United States, the Netherlands and other nations were requested and obtained from consuls. This type of message went not only to Honolulu (exhibits 1254, 1256-1264) and to Batavia (exhibit 1330), but as well to Portland, Seattle, Vancouver, Panama, Manila and elsewhere. These reports were handled as routine, and naturally neither the requests nor the reports — which were transmitted direct to the naval officials who had asked for them — underwent inspection by the Foreign Minister."

If the Tribunal please, I should like to ask one or two additional questions.

THE PRESIDENT: What has happened to defense document 1401-Z-1?

MR. BLAKENEY: That is what I wish to ask the questions about.

BY MR. BLAKENEY (Continued):

Q Mr. Witness, can you recall having received a report from Ambassador NOMURA in October 1941, in

which he reported as follows: that Minister WAKASUGI had had an interview with Under Secretary Welles at which some suggestion was made concerning future negotiations?

A Yes, I do recall a telegram to that effect from the United States.

MR. BLAKENEY: Please let the witness be handed defense document No. 1401-Z-1.

Please look at the document which is being handed to you, and state whether you can recognize it as the report in question.

This is the document which I recall.

Was this report called to the attention of the Liaison Conference?

This report was brought to the attention of the Liaison Conference about the end of October, which said conference was in the midst of drawing up concrete proposals vis-a-vis the Japanese-American negotiations. '

THE INTERPRETER: Correction: "This telegram arrived at the end of October, when," etc.

A (Continuing) As for us, after reading the statements made by Welles in the report, we felt that it would be difficult to reach -- arive at any solution of the pending issues between the two

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

countries by discussing the problems as a whole, and and that it would be more advisable to take problems which are possible of solution one by one; and this report was used as a convenient reference in formulating or drawing up Japan's draft of the proposal in drafting Proposal "A". MR. BLAKENEY: I offer in evidence the docu-7 ment, defense document 1401-Z-1. THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 9 CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 10 1401-Z-1 will receive exhibit No. 2959. 11 (Whereupon, the document above 12 referred to was marked defense exhibit 13 No. 2959 and received in evidence.) 14 THE PRESIDENT: This will take a long time 15 to read. What follows this phase, Major Blakeney, 16 17 this subdivision? 18 MR. BLAKENEY: Lo you mean what follows my 19 subdivision? 20 THE PRESIDENT: Yes. 21 MR. BLAKENEY: The military subdivision, I 22 understand, follows. 23 THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen 24 minutes.

25

(Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was

taken until 1100, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

Wolf & Lefler

1

3

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribual for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: I was about to read exhibit

2959, which is a telegram:

"From NOMURA to TOGO

"24 October 1941

"Reference to your telegram No. 698.

"WAKASUGI talked with Welles for an hour from 3:30 P.M. on the 24th.

"In accordance with your telegram, WAKASUGI said that the new Japanese Cabinet has as earnest a desire as the last Cabinet to arrive at a fair and equitable adjustment of Japanese-American relations, that Japan's position had already been made clear, and that, although no detailed instructions had yet been received from the home government, WAKASUGI might say that, according to what he himself observed during his recent visit to Japan, the circumstances did not permit of any further indefinite protraction of the present conversations, it being desirable to arrive at a conclusion as soon as possible and without even a day's unnecessary delay. WAKASUGI then asked for the presentation of the United States counter-proposal in response to the Japanese proposal of 25 September.

22

21

23 24

"Welles asked about the intentions of the new Cabinet in regard to the continuance of the present negotiations. Simultaneously, he pointed out that lately persons in responsible positions in Japan had been making bellicose statements: for example, the Navy spokesman had said in a statement that the Japanese Navy was 'itching for action;' and that the newspapers, etc., were vehemently attacking the United States. This fact, he pointed out, seriously irritated the Government and people of his country, and was injurious to the continuance of the present negotiations.

"WAKASUGI countered by saying that there were not a few influential statesmen in the United States, including for example, Senator Pepper, who were making vehement attacks on Japan. Above all, Secretary of the Navy Knox had said in a speech today that not only was a Japanese-American war una woidable, but the clash was imminent. There were many such bellicose utterances in the United States, and the Government and people of Japan were being no less irritated by them. Welles made repeated explanations to get WAKASUGI to understand that the speech of the Secretary of the Navy was not really so vehement, the press reports of it being merely exaggerations of its fragments; and that the Secretary of the Navy, as the

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

24

3

5

7 8

9

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21 22

23

25

highest person responsible for the Navy, the greatest force in the United States, was now and then using strong language in an attempt to encourage the Navy.

"Welles proceeded to say, with regard to the counter-proposal of the United States, that, as repeated at the previous talk, the principles and the counter-proposal of the United States were clear in the proposal of 21 June. One idea might be to attempt oral adjustment between the United States and Japanese proposals, but, according to the experience of informal conversations carried on, merely to stick to the formula hitherto followed and discuss it by items would lead only to a repetition of the same arguments as has already been made, and render it difficult to achieve progress in the negotiations. As had been said at the previous talk in the presence of Secretary Hull, it might therefore be a quicker was to make a fresh survey by a new formula consisting of taking up matters of a general character, such as the three problems, and in endeavoring to reach an agreement of views on them one by one, beginning with those which were comparatively easier of settlement. For this purpose, the question of non-discrimination in trade, on which it should be comparatively easier for both sides to reach an agreement of views, might first be

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

taken up (Whereupon Welles asked whether what had been emphasized by Hull at the previous talk had been communicated to the home government, and WAKASUGI replied that details thereof had been reported.) Secondly, the question of obligations under the Tripartite alliance might be discussed. To this question Welles referred in terms which might be taken as revealing the possibility of an adjustment on the United States side itself. Next, the China question might be talked over. Thus Welles made a new proposal in the negotiations, and showed an attitude indicating a marked desire to promote a compromise.

"WAKASUGI, in reply, said that today he was not at liberty to add anything to the Japanese proposal of 25 September, because no detailed instructions had yet been received from the home government. It was desirable, however, that, with regard to the new method of approach proposed by Welles, a proposal be formulated by the United States side and presented at the next talk. A study of this new approach would also be made by the Japanese side.

"With regard to the question of release of the frozen funds of the two Japanese tankers, referred to at the last talk, and of the two mail ships dispatched at this time, Welles said that steps had

15 16

17

18 19

20

22

21

23 24

partment, the necessary steps had already been taken in regard to the three mail ships. As for the tankers, there were strict regulations concerning United States banks... Two words undecipherable 7 the protection of bank depositors. Once funds had been put in an account at the Yokohama Specie Bank, it was difficult to release such frozen funds, no matter whether they were funds which had been in that bank previously or were remittance drafts just received from another country. If, therefore, the funds in question were made into drafts via United States banks, the State Department would do all in its power to meet the request.

The last-mentioned matter is again to be talked over with Financial Attache NISHIYAMA."

That concludes the general direct examination, and I understand that there will be further direct examination on behalf of three defendants, the first of whom, I believe, is Dr. KIYOSE on behalf of the defendant TOJO.

THE PRESIDENT: Dr. KIYOSE.

DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY DR. KIYOSE:

Q I refer to page 1, towards the end of page 1 of the affidavit, of the English affidavit. In

17 18

10

11

12

13.

14

15

16

19

21

22

23

paragraph 2, you state, "In October 1941 I was told
by Foreign Minister TOYODA that War Minister TOJO had
upon the demand of the High Command made a strong request to Premier KONOYE and the Foreign Minister to
present by the 15th or thereabouts their opinions on
the pending problems of the Japanese-American
negotiations." Where was this demand of the High
Command made?

A I heard that the request of the High

A I heard that the request of the High Command was made of Foreign Minister TOYODA at the Liaison Conference at the time.

Q Then, since Foreign Minister TOYODA himself was present at the Liaison Conference, may I understand that he did not necessarily have to hear this demand from War Minister TOJO but could have heard it direct from the Chief of the General Staff or other members of the General Staff?

THE MONITOR: The Chief of the Army General Staff or the Chief of the Navy General Staff.

A Yes.

Q Next, towards the middle of page 2 of the English text, I refer to your statement that the question of the withdrawal of troops from China -- the question of the stationing of troops in China was discussed at the Liaison Conferences held at that

time.

1

2

3

4 5

6

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

THE MONITOR: Between the 23rd of October and early November.

Q Were there not other important matters, from the standpoint of national defense, argued by the two Chiefs of Staff, that is to say, the Chief of the Army General Staff and the Chief of the Navy General Staff at that time?

A Yes, very serious discussions were held with regard to military materials, especially synthetic oil or liquid fuel.

Q As my last question, I refer to page 12 of the English affidavit. At the top of the page you refer to the fixing of the time for delivery of the notification to the American Government. Was this matter actually decided at the Liaison Conference itself or was it decided elsewhere?

A With reference to this question, at first the matters were discussed between the Foreign Minister and representatives of the High Command, and the results of their discussions were reported and received the approval of the Liaison Conference itself.

DR. KIYOSE: That concludes my direct examination.

MR. KAINO: I am counsel KAINO, representing 1 the defendant SUZUKI. 2 THE PRESIDENT: Counsel KAINO. DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued) BY MR. KAINO: 5 Q My questions will refer to paragraphs 21 and 22 of your affidavit -- to the numbered paragraphs 21 7 and 22. Was the final note of December 8 made -- were 9 the contents of the final note of December 8 made known 10. to persons other than the actual drafters of the note? 11 THE MONITOR: Participants in the liaison 12 conference previous to December 8. A No, they were not known to others outside of 14 these parties. Q Do you remember who attended the liaison 16 conferences after December 2nd? 17 I have no concrete recollection. 18 MR. KAINO: That is all. 19 MR. SHIMANOUCHI: I am SHIMANOUCHI. 20 THE PRESIDENT: Counsel SHIMANOUCHI. 21 MR. SHIMANOUCHI: I represent the defendant 22 23 OSHIMA.

24

DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. SHIMANOUCHI: '

25

13

4

5

7

9

10. 11

12

14

13

15 16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23 24

25

Q Did the Foreign Office convey to Ambassador OSHIMA in Berlin the decisions of the Imperial Conferences of 1941 and the Liaison Conferences held in that year?

A He was not notified.

Q Did or did not the Foreign Office convey to Ambassador OSHIMA in Berlin the course of the Japanese-American negotiations of 1941?

A I recall that a very simple notification was given to the Ambassador with regard to the fact that Japanese-American negotiations were under way by Foreign Minister MATSUOKA in May, 1941.

Q Were no other notifications made?

A I recall that instructions were sent in the end of November with respect to "no separate peace" -- the question of "no separate peace."

Q There were no other notifications made to Ambassador OSHIMA in regard to the Japanese-American negotiations?

A I have no recollection.

Q At the Liaison Conference held in 1941 between the Government and the High Command, were the thoughts --- were the opinions of Ambassador OSHIMA ever discussed or were they ever taken up as problems there?

A Reports from the field with regards to the

1 2 3

4

7

9

10

8

11 12

13 14

15

16

18

20 21

22

23 24

25

military situation were brought up at the Liaison Conference, but other than that he did not come up for discussion.

Q What was the extent of the argument in the Liaison Conference?

THE PRESIDENT: Oh, that is too indefinite.

Q Were there hot discussions at the -- Were there heated discussions at the Liaison Conference or were decisions arrived at rather simply?

THE PRESIDENT: Even that won't help. Those are not sensible questions.

Q At the Liaison Conference deciding on the opening of the Pacific War, were Ambassador OSHIMA's opinions ever discussed or were they taken up as a problem?

A They had never been brought up for discussion or as a question. It was not brought up for discussion cussion in any form.

Q Did the Foreign Minister ever inform

Ambassador OSHIMA of the decision to open war prior
to the actual opening of hostilities in the Pacific

Area?

A I recall that no notification was sent.

Q According to your affidavit Foreign Minister TOGO stated that in the event of war with America,

7 8

 Japan could expect no help from Germany -- in the event of a Pacific war Japan could expect no help from Germany. What were the opinions of the Army and Navy High Command at the Liaison Conference in regard to this question?

A At the Liaison Conference the Army and
Navy High Command were both in agreement with Foreign
Minister TOGO that not much help or assistance could
be expected from Germany.

Q Did the Foreign Office send instructions to
Ambassador OSHIMA regarding the conclusion of a
"no separate peace agreement" with Germany" just before
the outbreak of the Pacific War?

A Yes, instructions were sent.

Q What was the relationship between the Japanese decision to fight, the Germany entry into the war and the "no separate peace agreement with Germany"?

A The proposed agreement for a "no separate peace agreement" had no connection whatsoever with Japan's determination for war.

MR. SHIMANOUCHI: That concludes my direct examination.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brannon.

MR. BRANNON: On behalf of the accused SHIMADA and OKA I wish to cross-examine.

YAMAMOTO 26,122

THE PRESIDENT: Oh, that raises a nice question. What came out unexpectedly to the prejudice of either of those accused? We understood you to say or to agree that nothing in that affidavit operated to your prejudice.

MR. BRANNON: According to the rules as
I understand them, it specifically provides that
defense counsel may cross-examine even the general
witnesses for the defense. But, perhaps I am mistaken.

THE PRESIDENT: Those rules do not alter
the general position that you cannot cross-examine
a witness called for all unless he proves hostile
unexpectedly, and, in those circumstances, the Court
in the interests of justice allows you to cross-examine.

MR. BRANNON: I certainly card thonestly contend that it is a surprise, because I had the affidavit and I read every word in it. Mr. Levin, I believe, brought up the point the other day that he had understood it to be that he would have the right to cross-examination to indicate his dissent as to certain portions of the testimony.

10.

THE PRESIDENT: The position indicated to you was indicated to Mr. Levin.

MR. BRANNON: Well, it is quite possible, Mr. President, I may not proceed wrongly if I state I am asking questions on direct examination.

THE PRESIDENT: You may directly examine but not cross-examine.

MR. BRANNON: I shall attempt to proceed that way.

BY MR. BRANNON:

Q On page 2 of the English version of your testimony, the third paragraph, seventh line, you use the words "and the Naval General Staff." Later you struck these words. Now I want to ask you if you intended to insert these words in the first place in your affidavit or whether that was a mistake.

THE PRESIDENT: That is cross-examination.

MR. BRANNON: I am informed it was an error made by the witness, your Honor, or in the translation, that the words should never have appeared. I am not seeking to challenge his truthfulness.

THE PRESIDENT: What was intended to be excised from this affidavit was carefully considered.

MR. BRANNON: That is the point I am trying to make. Apparently this was an error on the part of

2

17

18

16

20 21

22

23 24

the witness. I want him to admit it, that is all.

THE PRESIDENT: When you are giving evidence on behalf of the accused represented by you, you may call this witness as your witness, subject to the permission of the Tribunal. There is no limit on what we may permit, but we won't permit this man to be cross-examined by you now.

MR. BRANNON: I was merely trying to save time, Mr. President. While he was on the stand I thought I could get my little matters taken care of; but I will reserve it until later.

MR. BLAKENEY: The witness is now available to the prosecution for cross-examination.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. TAVENNER:

Q Mr. YAMAMOTO, at the top of page 12 of your affidavit you state that at the Liaison Conference of December 6, 1947, the time was fixed for delivery of notification to the American Government at 1 p. m. on December 7. Now, in reply to a question by Doctor KIYOSE you stated that this matter was discussed between the Foreign Minister and the High Command prior to the Liaison Conference. On how many occasions were those discussions had prior to the Liaison Conference?

A I have stated in my affidavit that the results

61.1

of the discussion were reported at the Liaison Conference on the 6th and then there approved. It was on the 2nd of December that the Liaison Conference agreed that with respect to the time for the notification to be delivered, the Foreign Minister and the High Command should consult each other and draw up -- or come to a conclusion on the matter.

Q Now will you please answer my question?

How many conferences did the Foreign Minister and the

High Command have on this subject prior to the Liaison

Conference on December 6?

A I think informal discussions on this question were held twice.

Q What was the date of the second instance you refer to?

A About the 4th or 5th of December.

Q Was it the first occasion or on the second the day of the Liaison Conference that you mentioned a moment ago?

A I recall it as having taken place on the second.

Q Was a tentative decision reached on the 2nd date of the conference?

A On the 2nd it was merely decided that the matter would be left to consultation between the Foreign Minister and the High Command.

2

5

6

8

Š.

9

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

> 18 19

20 21

22

23 24

25

Q But you just told me that there were two conferences between the Foreign Ministry and the High Command, the first of which occurred on the 2nd. I am asking you if it is not true that on this date, the 2nd of December, a tentative decision was reached on the question of the time of notification, that is, decision between the Foreign Minister and the High Command.

A The informal decision between the Foreign Minister and the High Command was arrived at separately from the Liaison Conference on the 2nd.

Q I understand that perfectly, but do I understand you correctly also that the decision was reached on the 2nd of December between the Foreign Minister and the High Command?

A Yes, the informal decision, yes, that is, the first decision.

Q And that was the decision which was ultimately reported to the Liaison Conference on December 6, was it not?

A Not so. The results of the consultation between the Foreign Minister and the High Command on the 2nd was reported to the Liaison Conference on the 3rd. At that time the report made was that the time for delivery of notification was 12:30 o'clock. After

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

21

23

that the opinion of the High Command was submitted 2 to the Foreign Office with regard to the delivery time. The result of the original informal decision thus revised was what was reported to the Liaison conference on the 6th.

The hour 12:30 that you mentioned was 12:30 on December 7, Washington time, was it not?

Yes. A

And the final date and hour fixed was 1-p. m. December 7, Washington time?

That is so. A

Was that the agreement of all who attended the meeting between the Foreign Ministry and the High Command?

The consultation between the Foreign Office A and the High Command on this question was held between 18 the Foreign Minister and the Vice-Chief of the Army 19 General Staff and the Vice-Chief of the Naval General 20 Staff. No others attended.

And was the time fixed the common consent of 22 all three representatives at that meeting?

Before arriving at such a decision Foreign 24 Minister TOGO contended that arrangements should be 25 made so that the delivery of the note would take place sufficiently in advance, and it was after some dis-

1 cussion that the final agreement was reached.

Q When the final agreement was reached was

it with the unanimous approval of the Foreign Minister

and the High Command?

A Ultimately the agreed and unanimous opinion was reported to the Liaison Conference on the 6th.

Q Was the action taken also with the unanimous approval of the members of the Liaison Conference on December 6th?

A Yes. They all agreed.

Q Who were the vice-chief of the Army staff and vice-chief of the Navy staff who attended the conference representing the High Command?

A The vice-chief of the Army General Staff was TANABE; and of the Navy, Admiral ITO.

Q Who were those who attended the Liaison Conference of December 6th?

A I don't recall.

Q Who were those who attended on December 2nd or 3rd?

A I have no recollection as to who or how many people attended a conference on a certain date.

Q What reason was assigned for the changing of the hour of notification from 12:30 to 1:00 P.M.?

A I was not informed of the reason at the

18

17

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

20 21

22

23

time.

Q Will you state what you knew the reason to be?

A Even to this day I do not know anything more than the fact that the revision was made at the request of the High Command.

Q So far as you know, the reason was not associated with the attack on Pearl Harbor, that is, that the reason had nothing to do with the fixing of the time for the attack on Pearl Harbor?

A I never thought or knew whether or not it had anything to do with the Pearl Harbor attack.

Q Will you state whether or not the Foreign Minister told you why the hour was first fixed at 12:30?

A I have never heard of the reason.

Q At the time that this decision was presented to the Liaison Conference on December 6th, will you tell us what the discussion consisted of at that time and place, with reference to the hour for the delivery of the notice?

A On the 6th this was approved without any cussion after the matter had been reported.

Q When the matter was reported the first time to the Liaison Conrerence on December 3rd, will you

d

state what the discussion was with reference to the time of notice?

A There was no discussion on the occasion of the meeting on the 3rd of December.

A Did you make any inquiry from any source of the reason for the fixing of the hour of notification as it was fixed?

A I made no inquiry, nor made any attempt to obtain information concerning it.

Q Now why didn't you make inquiry about a matter of such vital importance as that, when you were handling a great deal of the diplomatic correspondence for the Foreign Ministry?

A My position in the Foreign Office was this:
that this note would be delivered to the United
States prior to the opening of hostilities, sufficiently in advance. Concerning this, when Foreign
Minister Togo told me that when they had their conference that he attended, he particularly stressed
this point of having this note arrive in Washington
on time and sufficiently in advance. This he agreed to.

Q At the time of the Liaison Conference on December 2nd, what reason was assigned for having the Foreign Minister consulted regarding the time of the note?

1 2

A The view of the Liaison Conference at that time with respect to this question was that it was proper that this matter first be consulted about between the High Command and the Foreign Minister, who was in charge of diplomatic matters — that a consultation should first be held between the High Command and the Foreign Minister and there decided.

Q What reason was assigned as to why the conference should be between the Foreign Minister and the High Command?

A The Foreign Minister was the responsible official with regard to diplomatic matters, for instance, with regard to the delivery of the note.

Q But why consult the High Command if that were true?

A I was interrupted in the middle of my reply previously, so I shall continue that, so that I can complete my statement. Diplomatic matters were in the hands of the Foreign Minister, that is, with respect to war, and operations within the hands of the High Command, and it was because of these reasons that these two parties were entrusted with consultation and decision on this matter.

Q I have asked you a simple question a number

of times: What reason was assigned by the Liaison Conference for that act?

To my knowledge there was no discussion as to what reasons were behind the idea. This step was taken as a matter of course.

THE PRESIDENT: I don't want to break into the cross-examination at a crucial phase, but I don't think that you will be prejudiced now if we recess until half past one.

(Whereupon at 1200 a recess was taken.)

K n p & Υ. e 1 d e

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330. MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed. THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

KUMAICHI YAMAMOTO, resumed the stand and testified, through Japanese interpreters, as follows:

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. TAVENNER (Continued):

Mr. YAMAMOTO, do you deny that the delay of one-half hour from 12:30 to 1:00 p.m. on July 7 was for the purpose of enabling the Foreign Ministry and the High Command to more nearly synchronize the time between the delivery of that note and the bombing of Pearl Harbor?

THE PRESIDENT: December 7.

MR. TAVENNER: Please substitute the month of December for that of July.

I deny that it was made for such a purpose.

Then why did you state this morning that you did not know the purpose? Explain that, please.

At that time I heard from Foreign Minister

Knapp & Yelden

1

2

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International

Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

KUMAICHI YAMAMOTO, resumed the stand and testified, through Japanese interpreters, as follows:

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. TAVENNER (Continued):

Q Mr. YAMAMOTO, do you deny that the delay of one-half hour from 12:30 to 1:00 p.m. on July 7 was for the purpose of enabling the Foreign Ministry and the High Command to more nearly synchronize the time between the delivery of that note and the bombing of Pearl Harbor?

THE PRESIDENT: December 7.

MR. TAVENNER: Please substitute the month of December for that of July.

A I deny that it was made for such a purpose.

Q Then why did you state this morning that you did not know the purpose? Explain that, please.

A At that time I heard from Foreign Minister

 TOGO that at the time of his consultation with the Vice Chief of the Naval General Staff he had insisted upon the delivery of the note considerably in advance of the opening of hostilities and that his request on that point was accepted by the Naval High Command. That is all that I heard. Moreover, in order to have you more clearly understand the circumstances at this time, I should like to supplement my remarks made previously.

On the 2d of December when the question of delivering a notification to the United States was brought up at the Liaison Conference for the first time, at this Liaison Conference the Vice-Chief of the Naval General Staff, Vice-Admiral ITO representing the naval branch of the High Command, made a very strong request that in view of the necessity of conducting a surprise attack and inflicting heavy damages upon the enemy at the outset of the opening of hostilities the Naval High Command would like to have the Japanese-American negotiations left alone and unruptured up to the time of the opening of hostilities.

With respect to this matter Foreign Minister TOGO asserted, as I have stated in my affidavit, as follows: that is to say, that Foreign Minister TOGO insisted at the Liaison Conference that international

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

arrangements for procedure of such kind must be handled with utmost propriety and care and that at least a notification giving notice of the severance of the negotiations was absolutely necessary. As a result of discussions following that in the Liaison Conference and no decision was reached it was decided at the time that this question be left to the Foreign Minister and the Vice-Chief of the General Naval Staff ITO for consultation between the two and that discussion in the Liaison Conference would be resumed following the conference between these two parties. It was also further decided at the Liaison Conference on December 2 that the question as to the time of delivery of the note also should be submitted to preliminary consultations between the Foreign Minister and the High Command and the results reported to the Liaison Conference. MR. TAVENNER: You have told us all of that

this morning. I do not desire for you to repeat testimony that you have already given.

THE PRESIDENT: He gave you some that was cut out and that will now give Mr. Brannon the right to cross-examine, but he is not here.

MR. TAVENNER: I expected to add that, your Honor, to my statement.

Q Therefore, your statement that there was a discussion at the meeting at the Liaison Conference of December 2 that the negotiations were to be carried on with a view of prolonging the time and to give Japan the opportunity to act is true, by a surprise attack?

MR. BLAKENEY: I object to counsel's putting words in the witness' mouth which the witness has never used.

THE PRESIDENT: I can see nothing objection-

MR. TAVENNER: Of course, I gave the general meaning of the words. I will now quote the item so that there will be no question about it.

Q Do you now state as being true this proposition: That Admiral ITO, Vice-Chief of the Naval General Staff, urged that negotiations be left unterminated until the belligerent operations actually commenced, it being absolutely necessary to deliver a blow to the United States at the very beginning of the war by a surprise attack?

A That is a fact.

Q Did you assist in the preparation of this note that was delivered on December 7, Washington time?

A Yes, I took part in that work.

Q In how many sections was that note prepared?

THE MONITOR: Mr. Tavenner, do you mean by
"section" the offices or part of the document, chapters?

MR. TAVENNER: I mean in how many sections
was the note prepared. How many sections comprised
the note?

A I have no definite recollections but I think

A I have no definite recollections but I think that it was comprised of eleven sections or eleven items.

Q Were there not fourteen parts?

A I think it was in such a condition that it may be broken down, the number of paragraphs which I mentioned could be broken down to around fourteen.

Q What disposition did you make of that note upon its completion?

A What do you mean by disposition of this notice? I should like to have that clarified.

Q After its completion what instructions did you receive about the sending of the note?

A I received the instructions from the Foreign Minister to exercise the utmost care in the filing of the telegram so that it would arrive at its destination at the time decided at the Liaison Conference.

Q Was the entire note sent at one time to Washington?

3

6

7

.

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

3

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

22

23 24

25

Q Is it not a fact that you delivered instructions that the fourteenth part should be held up and not sent to Washington until some time after the first thirteen had been sent?

A Yes.

Q Why did you direct that the fourteenth part be withheld from dispatch?

A Having received very strict instructions from my seniors to exercise the utmost care and caution because the document was extremely important and constituted and required from the standpoint of the preservation of state secret the utmost care in its handling, and therefore proper steps were taken in filing these in separate sections.

Q Do you contend, then, that by the mere delay in the sending of part fourteen that you were preserving the secrecy of the document?

A No, I do not make such an assertion. I was thinking of the preservation of secrets as regards the entire document.

Q Then why did you delay delivering the fourteenth part?

A I did not specially delay it.

A If you did not specially delay it, tell us to the extent that you did delay it, keeping in mind

3

5.

6

7

9

10

12

13 14

15 16

17

18

20

21

26

25

that you have already told us that you requested that part of it be delayed.

A What I mean by delayed in this connection is to file it last. However, as regards the entire document, the steps taken were to see that the entire document was telegraphed to Washington considerably in advance of the time which was set for delivery of the note so that the Embassy might prepare it for delivery.

Q You referred to the fourteenth part being the last part, but why did you take the precaution to notify the persons responsible for the sending of the message that the fourteenth part was to be delayed under instructions from your seniors?

A The fourteenth was the last section constituting the entire notice, and also the conclusion of the note.

Q And that is the only reason that the fourteenth part was sent last? Is that the reason that you assign for delay in sending the fourteenth part?

A We handled the entire telegram on the understanding, from the standpoint of the preservation of secrets because we were extremely apprehensive at that time lest the coded telegram be decoded.

3

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

13

14

15

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

Q Now, Mr. YAMAMOTO, you know as a matter of fact that under your directions and as a result of your directions, the sending of the fourteenth part was delayed fifteen hours and forty minutes, do you not?

MR. BLAKENEY: I object to the question unless counsel states from what time he means delayed; from the time of the decision on the notice, from the time of the instructions to send it, or what.

THE PRESIDENT: I understood him to suggest a fifteen hours' delay between the two parts.

MR. TAVENNER: Yes.

THE PRESIDENT: If I am right, the question is clear enough.

MR. TAVENNER: That, of course, is correct,

A As I have been saying that there was no intention whatsoever to delay the filing of these telegrams, the question was at what time the telegram in sections must be filed.

Q Now, you told us a moment ago that you directed that the fourteenth part be delayed pursuant to the directions of your seniors. I ask you, was not the real reason for the delay in the sending of

part fourteen that you desired this to be another effort to more nearly synchronize the time of the delivery of this note with the bombing of Pearl Harbor?

A To such a question I should like to state emphatically as follows: The rigid instruction was to have the note filed by telegram to arrive in Washington in the hands of the Japanese Ambassador there sufficiently in advance of 1:00 P. M.,

December 7, Washington time, at which time the note was to be delivered to the United States Government. To take all possible means to assure the delivery, the arrival of the telegrams at the Japanese Embassy sufficiently in advance of that appointed time, was the duty entrusted to me. That was all; nothing else.

Q You know, as a matter of fact, that the thirteenth part arrived in Washington at 12:20 A. M. on the 7th, Tokyo time, do you not? But you delayed the fourteenth section or part so that it arrived --

I would like to correct my statement.

You know, as a matter of fact, do you not, that this note was sent at -- that is, the first thirteen parts -- at 12:20 A. M., Tokyo time, on the 7th of December, and that you did not send the fourteenth

part until 4:00 P. M. of the 7th, Tokyo time? And you also know, do you not, that it was in this fourteenth part that the entire reference to action by Japan, aggressive action by Japan, was set forth?

when the telegrams arrived in Washington. At that time I did not know. And I do know that the last section of the note was prepared as the conclusion of the entire note conveying to the United States Government the attitude of the Japanese Government, and prepared with utmost care by the Foreign Ministry, and I have no knowledge whatsoever as to whether this, the filing of these notes, had anything to do with actual hostilities, actual acts of hostilities. However, I do remember and I do know that the note, the entire note, was to be delivered in Washington sufficiently in advance of the opening of hostilities.

Q You also know it to be a fact that Ambassador NOMURA was instructed not to use a typist in the transcribing of that note when it was decoded, do you not?

A Yes.

Duda & Spratt

Q You further know that it was the position of Admiral NAGANO that this section 14 was not received in time to enable the decoding and the typing and the delivery of this note within the time before the attack on Pearl Harbor, do you not?

A It was only later that I learned that that was the state of affairs at the time.

Q Now, who were your seniors who directed that you delay the sending of part 14?

As I have been saying, the 14th section was not delayed; nor was there any intention to delay it. With respect to the cabling of the telegram, the naval high command was extremely interested in this data, and after discussing matters with them and in accordance with the instructions of my seniors to see that the secret was preserved with utmost care in the filing of this message, arrangements were made to send the note, to telegraph the note in sections and at different times.

Q Well, suppose you tell us who your seniors were. That may be shorter.

A My seniors were Foreign Minister TOGO and Vice-Foreign Minister NISHI.

Q You have stated in your affidavit that you attended all the Liaison Conferences during the TOGO

•

Cabinet, which was from the 18th of October 1941 to a date, I believe, in 1943?

THE PRESIDENT: TOJO, I take it to be.

MR. TAVENNER: In the TOJO Cabinet.

A Yes, I did attend.

Q How many Liaison Conferences were held between the 18th of October and December 8, 1941?

A From October 23 to the morning of the 20d of November the Liaison Conference was held daily, and between November 6 and November 29 I think the Liaison Conference was convened five or six times; and I recall in December Liaison Conferences were held on the 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 6th.

Q Will you tell me how long those conferences were usually in session?

A In most cases Liaison Conferences were convened from either nine or ten o'clock in the morning up to noon, but from the end of October Liaison Conferences frequently lasted from 9 A. H. to about midnight or one or two o'clock the following morning.

Q What was the character of the work of these conferences between October 23 and December 8?

A The foremost question for discussion and most of the work of the Liaison Conference beginning

American negotiations to a successful conclusion.

Q Who presided over these meetings?

A There was no such thing as a presiding officer at the conferences. There was only a secretary who made preparations for the conferences.

Q What ministries were represented at these conferences?

A The regular members representing the government at the Liaison Conferences were the Prime Minister, the War Minister, the Navy Minister, the Foreign Minister, the Finance Minister, and the President of the Planning Board. Representing the High Command, the Chief of the Naval General Staff and the Chief of the Army General Staff were always in attendance.

Q Then TOJO as the Prime Minister was present at these Liaison Conferences; is that correct?

A Yes.

Q TOGO, who was the Foreign Minister, was also present at these conferences?

A Yes.

Q The President of the Planning Board, was he present also?

A Yes.

Q And the President was SUZUKI?

A Yes.

24

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2

4

ď

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21 22

23 24

25

Q Now, the Chief of the Military Affairs Bureau was present also, wasn't he?

A The Chief of the Military Affairs Bureau of the War Ministry and the Chief of the Naval Affairs Bureau of the Navy Ministry attended the meetings as secretaries.

Q And MUTO at this time was present as the Chief of the Military Affairs Bureau and also as Chief of the Naval Affairs Bureau?

A Yes.

Q Now, the Chief Secretary of the Cabinet was also present, wasn't he?

A The Chief Secretary of the Cabinet attended as one of the secretaries of the conference.

Q And the Chief Secretary at this time was HOSHINO, was he not?

A Yes.

Q The Finance Minister attended also?

A Yes.

Q And that was the accused KAYA?

A That is so.

Q Now, you have also told us that you attended most of the Liaison Conferences that were held during the third KONOYE Cabinet?

Yes, at the time of the third KONOYE Cabinet.

At that time I attended the Liaison Conference meetings

as the Director of the East Asiatic Affairs Bureau

of the Foreign Office, when in these conferences the

China problems were discussed, serving as an assis-

tant to the Foreign Minister and also as an explainer.

Q Let me return for a moment to the conferences

held during the TOJO Cabinet. SHIMADA. the Navy Minister, also attended, did he not? Yes.

The vice-ministers of the army and the navy also attended the Liaison Conferences, did they not? 2 The vice-ministers did not attend. 3 Were there not occasions on which they did Q 4 attend? 5 I have no definite recollection. 6 You would not state they did not attend, 7 as I understand it, but you only state that you do 8 not recall? Is that correct? 9 Ordinarily they did not attend. Whether or 10 not at some time during these conferences they 11 attended or not, I have no definite recollection. 12 Q Let us now proceed to the third KONOYE 13 Cabinet. Did the same officials of the government 14 and the army and the navy attend the Liaison Conferences 15 16 during the KONOYE Cabinet as during the TOJO Cabinet? 17 I believe that the ministers who attended 18 the Liaison Conference during the third KONOYE 19 Cabinet were not necessarily representative of the 20 same ministries as those during the TOJO Cabinet. 21 I will ask you about certain ones. Did the 22 Chief of the Military Affairs Bureau attend, MUTO? 23 Yes, he did. 24 And did OKA, the Chief of the Naval Bureau,

25

attend those conferences?

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14 15

16 17

> 18 19

20 21

22

25

24

A Yes.

Q And did SUZUKI, the President of the Planning Board, attend?

A Yes, he did.

Q Did the Minister of State attend?

A Minister without Portfolio, HIRANUMA, attended sometimes.

Q That was HIRANUMA?

A Yes, that is so.

Q And the War Minister, TOJO, attended, did he not?

A Yes, he did.

Q I notice on the first page of your affidavit, a reference to meetings with the military bureau directors concerned with the negotiations.

Let me repeat the question. I note on the first page of your affidavit, a reference to meetings attended by you or conducted by you and which were attended by the military bureau directors concerned with negotiations. Were these military bureau directors the Chief of the Military Affairs Bureau and the Chief of the Navy Affairs Bureau?

A Yes, that is so.

Q And they were the accused MUTO and OKA?

A Yes.

as to the question of credibility, I desire to merely refer to the place in the record where this witness was cross-examined on a former occasion, pages 17,929 to 18,006, and again at pages 18,032 to 18,062, with special reference to page 18,059.

With regard to the voluminous documents introduced through this witness, it is submitted that they, like all other documents in evidence, in the last analysis are matters for construction by the Tribunal.

There are no further questions.

THE PRESIDENT: I have a question on behalf of a Member of the Tribunal. I will paraphrase it, if I may.

On what particular words of the concluding paragraph of the document did the participants in the Liaison Conference base their belief and conclusion that the intention of going to war was clearly expressed?

That refers to part 14, if I apprehend the document correctly.

these vards are to be found in perspears 14 or the above mentioned comment: the Commissionth installment or section.

THE PRESIDENT: Can you be a little more

2

1

5

6

7

8

,

10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

specific than that? Can you indicate what the words are?

THE WITNESS: In these words: "Thus, the earnest hope of the Japanese Government to adjust Japanese-American relations and to preserve and promote the peace of the Pacific through cooperation with the American Government has finally been lost. The Japanese Government regrets to have to notify the American Government that in view of the attitude of the American Government, it cannot but consider that

it is impossible to reach an agreement through further negotiations."

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brannon.

MR. BRANNON: Under the rules, if the Tribunal please, I feel that I now have the right to ask one or two short questions.

THE PRESIDENT: That was stated by the Tribunal in your absence, Mr. Brannon. I know you were working in another room in the building.

MR. BRANNON: Still on behalf of the accused SHIMADA and OKA.

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. BRANNON:

Q You have stated that several of the accused attended the Liaison Conferences in the capacity of

3

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

13

15

16

14

17

18

20

22

23 24

25

secretaries. I will ask you if they had any vote in any of the decisions that were there made?

A The secretaries had no power to vote.

MR. BRANNON: I ask that question, if the Tribunal please, on behalf of all of the accused who attended in the capacity of secretaries.

THE PRESIDENT: You represent only two, I think, but--

MR. BRANNON: I was whispered to here, Mr. President.

Q Former Admiral ITO, who was Vice-Chief of Naval General Staff in 1941, is now dead, is he not?

A Yes.

Q I will ask you if you recall being questioned by me in my office in this building on March 11 of this year?

A I remember having had a conversation with you on the 11th of March, but I do not remember having been interrogated.

Q Do you recall that there was a translator there and also a reporter taking down what you said?

A I did not talk with you then on the understanding that I was to be interrogated or to be examined. I merely talked with you on the understanding that it was to be a mutual conversation. I remember that there was an interpreter and also that there was a reporter writing our conversation down.

Q Do you recall at that time telling me that at a certain Liaison Conference around the first of November you had occasion to be with the former accused Admiral NAGANO in the palace, and there engaging him in private conversation?

A That is true.

Q Did you tell me that in these words: "During the conference I was walking in the compound of the palace. Admiral NAGANO came to me and said that the navy doesn't want this war and asked that the Foreign Office take full responsibility of concluding negotiations with the United States peacefully." Did you say that?

A I do remember that Admiral NAGANO said words to that effect. However, in order to avoid misunder-standing, I should like to quote the words which Admiral NAGANO used in clearer language here. That is to say, he said that the navy high command still had the earnest desire of avoiding war as much as possible; that it had had such a desire and that even at that date it continued to have such a desire.

Admiral NAGANO continued: "Therefore, if the Foreign Minister will say, 'I will take full

31.0

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

minutes. 20

responsibility for the amicable solution of these negotiations, then I, Admiral NAGANO, will oppose the opening of hostilities." Correction: "That I, Fleet Admiral NAGANO, would support the Foreign Minister and oppose any decision for war," and asked what I thought about it. In reply, I told Admiral NAGANO that if everything was to be left completely in the Foreign Minister's hands, if all conditions were to be left absolutely up to the Foreign Minister, then he could take full responsibility for the successful conclusion of these negotiations; but that I, YAMAMOTO, felt that in the present state of affairs in which various conditions were put forth to the Foreign Minister, and having to negotiate with America on the basis of these various conditions, I could not guarantee such a thing; even the Foreign Minister could not guarantee such a thing.

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen

(Whereupon, at 1445 a recess was taken until 1500, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

24

Wolf & Lefter

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far ast is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brannon

MR. BRANNON: I believe the witness was answering a question.

- Q Had you finished your answer, Mr. Witness?
- A Yes, I did.
- Q Do you recall my asking you at that time if this thought as expressed was typical of the Navy thought at the Liaison Conference, Mr. YAMAMOTO; and do you recall answering, "I think it was representative of the Navy's views in these things?"
 - A What do you refer to?
- Q The attitude of the then Chief of the Navy General Staff in reference to peaceful negotiations with the United States.
- A I remember having had such a conversation with him -- with you.
- Now, you have testified that the man in the Navy Ministry, with whom you had conversations relative to the make-up of the last notification, was the accused OKA, have you not?
 - A Yes, I do.
- Q Did you have many conversations with OKA relative to this draft?

23

24

A I did have several conversations with him.

Q Did not the accused OKA present you with a corrected copy of the draft, which had been prepared by him, containing the words, "The Japanese Government reserves the freedom of action?"

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER: If it please the Tribunal, under the guise of cross-examination it appears to the prosecution that an effort is being made to examine this witness as though it were direct examination in that grossly leading questions are being asked.

THE PRESIDENT: He had the right to examine in chief, but he did not press for that. He has earned the right to cross-examine, which would be by way of leading questions because of something adverse said.

MR. TAVENNER: My only point, your Honor, is that he should not be permitted to lead the witness on a matter which is not in contradiction of some previous testimony.

THE PRESIDENT: This is the position: This witness said something which gave Mr. Brannon the right to cross-examine on behalf of two of the accused. Is this question he is putting now related to that matter?

1

6 7

5

9

10

8

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

21

22

23 4

24 25

MR. TAVENNER: That is the point, your Honor, that I am raising, that this seems to be a new matter and he is cross-examining in regard to it and asking leading questions in a way that would be permissible if it were cross-examination, in all probability, but would not be permitted in direct examination.

THE PRESIDENT: How is the question you are putting now, Mr. Brannon, related to the adverse matter that gave you the right to cross-examine?

MR. BRANNON: It was brought out that this witness conferred with the accused OKA relative to the drafting of the notification. I do not know what import the Tribunal may put on that, but I seek now to show exactly what it was. We accepted it as having possible adverse tendencies.

THE PRESIDENT: You can put any questions directed to destroying the effect of the adverse matter, but that is the limit.

Put the question again.

MR. BRANNON: Will the reporter read the question back?

> (Whereupon, the last question was read by the official court reporter as follows: "Did not the accused OKA present you with a corrected copy of the draft,

which had been prepared by him, containing the words, 'The Japanese Government reserves the freedom of action?'")

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, may I be heard on that?

THE PRESIDENT: I thought you abandoned your ground and took your seat at the table again.

MR. TAVENNER: We submit, if the Tribunal please, that that is purely re-examination on the original affidavit, that it is not cross-examination. The only statement in the affidavit to which this matter refers, we are convinced, is the statement that this witness conferred with the Chief of the Navy and Military Affairs Bureau. Now it is being sought to introduce in evidence in a leading form statements that were made by the Navy Chief of the Naval Affairs Ministry, or Bureau, which he could not do if it were examination in chief.

THE PRESIDENT: The witness said something, not in his affidavit, prejudicial to OKA. What was that? The question that Mr. Brannon puts now must be related to that and intended to meet it. That is a narrow issue.

MR. BRANNON: Mr. President, I can withdraw this question. We can handle it better later on in

1 2

3

4

6

'7

9

10

11

12

13

15

.16 '17

18

19

21

22

23

2

3

21

22

23

24

25

opinions.

our individual phase. BY MR. BRANNON (Continued): taries at the Liaison Conferences. 10 11 We have one last question. 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20

I would like to ask you, Mr. Witness, as my last question, to explain the function of the secre-The work of the secretaries was the gathering and preparation of subjects for discussion at the Liaison Conference and also the summing of subjects already discussed at the Liaison Conference. MR. BRANNON: That concludes my examination. THE PRESIDENT: On whose behalf? MR. BRANNON: On behalf of all the secretaries who attended. I have been requested by their counsel; also OKA whom I represent personally. THE PRESIDENT: You told us the secretaries have no vote. Is that what you want to get out of him? MR. BRANNON: The last question is: Could a secretary express his own opinion at the Liaison Conference? MR. BRANNON: That goes a little further, Mr. President. Secretaries could not express their own

THE PRESIDENT: You heard what he said,

MR. USAMI: My name is USAMI. I appear
for the accused HIRANUMA and I want to cross-examine
on matters specifically related to my client.

THE PRESIDENT: What matters? Were they matters brought out by the cross-examination?

MR. USAMI: Yes, they were.

THE PRESIDENT: What matters?

MR. USAMI: HIRANUMA attended one or two liaison conferences during the period of the Third KONOYE Cabinet.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner cross-examined about attendances at those conferences, but I do not recollect that HIRANUMA's name was mentioned. He may have been mentioned by another description.

MR. USAMI: My recollection is that Mr.

Tavenner asked the witness whether he remembered any one of the State Ministers, Ministers without Portfolio, attended the conference, and the answer of the witness was that he thought he had remembered seeing HIRANUMA attending one or two liaison conferences.

MR. TAVENNER: That is correct.

THE PRESIDENT: Do you admit that, Mr.

Tavenner?

MR. TAVENNER: That is correct, your Honor, with the exception that I recall he said "sometimes"

•

instead of "one or two."

THE PRESIDENT: You have the right to cross-examine.

MR. USAMI: Thank you.

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. USAMI:

Q Mr. Witness, do you recall that the Third KONOYE Cabinet was formed on July 18, 1941?

A Yes, I do.

Q Do you recall that on the 14th of August State Minister HIRANUMA, not quite one month after he had entered the Cabinet, had been attacked by an assassin and was injured seriously?

A f well remember that incident.

Q With reference to your recollection of Baron HIRANUMA attending the Liaison Conference, was it during this very short period or was it later on that you recall seeing him attending the Conference?

A It is a very faint recollection that I have of Baron HIRANUMA attending these conferences during this very short period.

Q About how many times do you recall having met him there?

A I do not remember clearly. I believe it was two, and at the most, three times.

4

1

2

5

6

7 8

9

10

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

20

21

22

24

25

on the usual terms.

1	Q Were you in attendance at those conferences?
2	A Yes.
3	Q Do you recall the agenda?
4	A No, I do not.
	Q Do you recall whether or not State Minister
5	HIRANUMA spoke at any of these conferences?
7	A As far as I remember, State Minister HIRANUMA
8	made no remarks whatsoever.
9	Q Do you know whether or not State Minister
10	HIRANUMA, during the tenure of the Third KONOYE Cabinet,
11	after he had been attacked and injured by assassins,
12	was able to perform his duties of Minister without
13	Portfolio or attend conferences?
14	A According to my recollection, Baron HIRANUMA
15	did not recover sufficiently to be able to attend to
16	state affairs during the period of the tenure of the
17	KONOYE Cabinet.
18	THE MONITOR: After the attack on him.
19	MR. USAMI: That concludes my cross-examination
20	MR. BLAKENEY: There will be no general re-
21	examination and so far as I am advised, subject to
22	examination and so far as a re-examination.
23	correction, there will be no re-examination. I therefore ask that the witness be excused
	I therefore ask that the withing

THE PRESIDENT: He is excused accordingly.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.) MR. BLAKENEY: I call as my next witness KASE TOSHIKAZU, whose testimony is embodied in his affidavit, defense document No. 2063.

V)

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

25

TOSHIKAZU KASE,

called as a witness in behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

MR. BLAKENEY: Before qualifying the witness I should like to call attention to a typographical error in the affidavit: On page 2, paragraph 3,
line 4, between the words "been" and "delivered"
there should be inserted the words "cabled to Washington to be", so that the sentence will read: "The
memorandum is unrelated to the President's message,
it having been cabled to Washington to be delivered
to Mr. Hull before Mr. TOGO saw the Emperor on the
matter."

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BLAKENEY:

- Please state your name:
- A KASE, Toshikazu.
- Q Where is your residence?
- A Kamakura, Omachi, Tasane 330.
- Q What is your occupation?
- A Counsel of Embassy.
- Q I wish that you be handed defense document

number 2063 and that you examine that and state to

the Tribunal whether it is your affidavit, bearing your signature and seal.

- A It is my affidavit and bears my signature.
- Q Are the contents thereof true and correct?
- A True and correct.

MR. BL/KENEY: I offer the affidavit in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2063

will receive Exhibit Number 2960.

(Whereupon the document referred to was marked Exhibit No. 2960 and received in evidence.)

MR. BLAKENEY: I now read the exhibit which, omitting the formal parts, is as follows:

"1. I entered the Japanese Foreign Ministry in 1925 and was appointed Chief of the First Section of the Bureau of American Affairs of that ministry in November 1941, continuing in that position until April 1943. In the course of my official duties as such section chief I was familiar with the matters herein testified to.

"2. Soon after my arrival at the Foreign Ministry at about 10 o'clock in the morning of 7
December 1941 (Tokyo time), I received information

5

1

2

3

6

3 9

10

11

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

from the Domei News Agency that the United Press had carried a report to the effect that the State Department had announced the dispatch of r personal message by President Roosevelt addressed to His Majesty the Emperor. I immediately reported the matter to my superiors, including Messrs. TOGO, the Foreign Minister, NISHI, Vice Foreign Minister and YAMAMOTO, the Director of the American Bureau. I then telephoned to alert Marquis MATSUDAIRA, private secretary to the Lord Privy Seal, and asked him to let us know at once when and if the Imperial Palace received the President's message. For we were under the impression that, being a personal message, it would be sent directly to the Emperor, as in the case of the Panay incident of December 1937. An urgent telegram was dispatched without delay to Admira NOMURA, our Ambassador in Washington, instructing him to make inquiries into, and report back upon the matter (telegram No. 905, from TOGO to NOMURA, Defense Document No. 1401-F-3)," which at this point I offer in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT. Defense Document 1401F-3 will receive Exhibit No. 2961.

(Whereupon the document in question

2

4

5

6

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

from the Domei News Agency that the United Press had carried a report to the effect that the State Department had announced the dispatch of a personal message by President Roosevelt addressed to His Majesty the Emperor. I immediately reported the matter to my superiors, including Messrs. TOGO, the Foreign Minister, NISHI, Vice Foreign Minister and YAMAMOTO, the Director of the American Bureau. I then telephoned to alert Marquis MATSUDAIRA, private secretary to the Lord Privy Seal, and asked him to let us know at once when and if the Imperial Palace received the President's message. For we were under the impression that, being a personal message, it would be sent directly to the Emperor, as in the case of the Panay incident of December 1937. An urgent telegram was dispatched without delay to Admiral NOMURA, our Ambassador in Washington, instructing him to make inquiries into, and report back upon the matter (telegram No. 905, from TOGO to NOMURA, Defense Document No. 1401-F-3)," which at this point I offer in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT. Defense Document 1401-F-3 will receive Exhibit No. 2961.

(Whereupon the document in question

23 25

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

was marked Exhibit No. 2961, and received in evidence.)

MR. BLAKENEY: I shall read the exhibit:

"7 December 1941.

"From TOGO to NOMURA.

"The AP and UP news agencies report that the State Department has disclosed the dispatch by the President of a personal telegram to the Emperor. Make report immediately about the facts thereof."

Continuing with the affidavit;

"Apparently crossing this telegram on the way, a short dispatch from Admiral NOMURA arrived at the Foreign Ministry in the afternoon (telegram No. 1275 from NOMURA to TOGO, Defense Document No. 1401-E-3)," which I offer in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense Document

No. 1401-E-3 will receive Exhibit No. 2962.

(Whereupon the document in question was marked Exhibit No. 2962, and received in evidence.)

MR. BLAKENEY: I read this telegram, which is from NOMURA to TOGO, dated 6 December, 1941:

"In the evening of the 6th, the Department of State disclosed that the President had dis-

patched a personal telegram to his Majesty the Emperer. The contents of the message are unknown, but it is generally assumed that it concerns the reinforcement of troops in French Indo-China and the advance into Thailand, in view of the simultaneous disclosure by the Department, based on information received, that in addition to one hundred twenty-five thousand troops already stationed in French Indo-China, two corps were moving this morning into the Gulf of Siam (refer to news dispatch).

"The dispatch of the message by the President to the Emperor directly, and not through diplomatic channels, may, it is considered, be the result of taking into consideration our steps in connection with the personal message on the Panay incident some years ago."

Continuing with the affidavits

"This confirming the authenticity of the press news, I instructed all the staff in my office to be alerted for urgent work and waited for the arrival of the message in question. However, as nothing happened, I got in touch with Marquis MATSUDAIRA once again in the evening, shortly after 8 P.M., by telephoning his residence. I was told that the President's message had not arrived yet.

"3. At about 10:15 F.M. Mr. TOMODA Jiro, private secretary to the Foreign Minister, received a telephone call from the American Embassy requesting him to make an appointment around midnight for the Ambassedor to see the Foreign Minister. I understand that Mr. TOMODA asked if the Ambassador could not wait until the next morning, but was told that an urgent telegram was being decoded and that the Ambassador wanted to see Mr. TOGO as soon as it was ready. Shortly after midnight -- at about 12:30 A.M., 8 December -- Mr. Grew came to the official residence of the Foreign Minister where the interview took place; I was present at this meeting and interpreted the conversation. Saying that he had received an urgent message of the President to the Emperor, Mr. Grew requested the Foreign Minister to arrange an audience for him. Mr. TOGO replied that it was unusual to take action on a request for audience at midnight, and inquired about the substance of the message. Thereupon, the Ambassador left a copy of the message with Mr. TOGO for the latter's reference, and took leave of the Foreign Minister after repeating his request for the audience, stressing the extreme gravity of the situation. The interview lasted about 15 minutes Mr. TOGO gave me the copy and asked me to translate

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

11

10

13

12

15

14

16 17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

with the help of my staff. I still vividly remember the very tense atmosphere that prevailed in my office, where everybody worked frantically in order to avoid delay in translating the message. Meanwhile, Mr. TOGO got in touch with Marquis KIDO, the Lord Privy Seal, by telephone, asking him to arrange for him to report the matter to the Throne. He then, I understand, went to the Premier's residence, consulted with General TOJO, and left his official residence at about 2 A.M. for the Imperial Palace, there informing the Emperor of the President's message and receiving the answer to be sent through the American Ambassador.

me on the previous day, I requested Mr. Grew early in the morning of 8 December to call on the Foreign Minister. This was originally for the purpose of handing to the Ambassador a copy of the memorandum of the Japanese Government, terminating the diplomatic conversations, which had been delivered by Admiral NOMURA at Washington to the American Government. This meeting would have taken place even if Mr. Grew had not paid the midnight visit to the Foreign Minister in connection with the President's message. Mr. Grew

-.....

at about 7:30 A.M., at which time I was again present at the meeting interpreting the conversation.

Mr. TOGO gave the Ambassador a copy of the memorandum with the remark that it was a copy of the document already delivered to the American Government by Admiral NOMURA. He told the Ambassador also that during the night he had had occasion to learn the wishes of the Emperor in regard to the President's message, and orally transmitted the reply which was later written out at the Ambassador's request (Exhibit 1247).

"Although Mr. Grew seems to be under the impression that the memorandum of the Japanese Government constituted the Emperor's reply, this is a misunderstanding on his part. The memorandum is unrelated to the President's message, it having been cabled to Washington to be delivered to Mr. Hull before Mr. TOGO saw the Emperor on the matter.

"5. We in the Foreign Ministry, including
Mr. TOGO, had no slightest suspicion that the Communications Ministry might delay the delivery of
telegrams addressed to the American Embassy. Moreover, we did not think that the President's message
would be delivered to the Embassy. We took it for

2

3

granted that it was addressed directly to the Emperor. Such an assumption was in fact supported by Admiral NOMURA'S telegram (No. 1275), Defense Document No. 1401-E-3)," that is, Defence Exhibit No. 2962, "which said that the President had sent his message directly to the Emperor without going through the usual diplomatic channels. We, therefore, waited anxiously for word from the Imperial Palace of the arrival of the message. That being the case, the Foreign Ministry had no idea regarding the substance of the message. In fact, Mr. TOGO learned the content of the message only when the American Ambassador brought it to his attention at the midnight interview above described."

You may cross-examine.

17

18

22

23

24

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. TAVENNER:

O Mr. KASE, was it the practice in the Foreign Ministry to send a messenger from the Foreign Ministry to the Ministry of Communications daily for such telegrams as would interest the Foreign Ministry?

A We of the First Section of the American
Bureau -- Bureau of American Affairs had nothing to
do with this and consequently didn't know anything
about it.

O Do you mean to state that you don't know whether or not it was the practice to send a messenger to the Communications Ministry each day?

A Not necessarily.

Q I am unable to hear you.

A Not necessarily.

THE PRESIDENT: How does "necessarily" come into it? You asked about a practice.

THE WITNESS: What I meant was that we did know that a messenger was sent. We did know that messengers were sent daily. However, since our section did not handle such affairs we didn't know for what purpose -- what specific purpose such messengers were sent.

2

5

3

4

6

.

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

BY MR. TAVENNER:

O But you do know that messengers were sent daily to pick up telegrams in which the Foreign Ministry was interested, do you not?

A I don't know whether they went every day.

However, I do know there was such a practice.

On this particular occasion you knew a day or more in advance that an important message was to be received or had been sent from the President of the United States?

A As is written in my affidavit, I did know of that.

about sending a messenger for this important message from the President of the United States?

A As I have already told you, this had nothing to do with the First Section of the American Affairs Bureau. Therefore I don't know anything about it.

Q Well, you were interested in seeing the telegram, were you not?

A Yes. As you say, we were waiting for the arrival of that telegram.

Q Why did you not follow the accustomed practice of sending a messenger to pick up the telegram?

A At that time the Communications Ministry was

10

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

14 15

16

17

18

20

21

23

24

not even in our minds. All we were thinking of was about the Imperial Household Ministry. We were sure that that was where the telegram would go, and that is where our attention was directed.

Q Then, on this particular day you abandoned the accustomed practice of sending a messenger for cables that were of interest to the Foreign Ministry?

A This practice of sending a messenger to the Communications Ministry had been carried on in the past entirely separate from the Bureau of American Affairs. That is to say, the American Affairs Bureau had nothing whatsoever to do with it. Therefore on this occasion also the Bureau of American Affairs had no thought even of the Communications Ministry.

Q When you inquired first as to whether or not this message from the President had been received by the Emperor and you were advised that it had not been, why didn't you send a messenger then, according to the usual practice?

A Since other bureaus and other sections were handling relations with the Communications Ministry, and since our bureau had nothing whatsoever to do with the Communications Ministry, we did not take up that matter.

Q Is not the real reason why you did not bother

to send a messenger the fact that you knew that an order had been entered to hold up the delivery of messages for, I believe it was, ten hours?

A That is absolutely contrary to the facts.

To begin with, it wasn't our job to communicate with the Communications Ministry; and secondly, we didn't know at the time that an order had been issued to the Communications Ministry to hold up telegrams. In fact, we didn't know of it until a witness from the Communications Ministry testified to that effect last year.

Q Well, now, did you not know, as a matter of fact, that the contents of this message were being discussed in the afternoon over the telephone between the Army General Staff and the Communications Ministry?

A I didn't know about that at all.

Q Well, you know now, do you not, that the matter was being discussed in the afternoon between that ministry and the Army General Staff?

A Yes, I heard of that. I became aware of that through the testimony of the witness from the Communications Ministry last year.

MR. TAVENNER: That is all.

MR. BLAKENEY: There will be no re-examina-

tion.

May the witness be excused on the usual 1 terms? THE PRESIDENT: He is excused accordingly. (Whereupon, the witness was excused.) MR. BLAKENEY: I call as my next witness MATSUDAIRA Yasumasa, whose testimony is embodied in 5 his affidavit, defense document 1030, revised. 7 YASUMASA MATSUDAIRA, called as a 8 witness on behalf of the defense, being first 9 duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpre-10 11 ters as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION 12 13 BY MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. Witness, please state your name and resi-14 15 dence. My name is MATSUDAIRA Yasumasa. My address 16 is No. 912 Yoyogi Nishihara Machi, Shibuya-Ku, Tokyo. 17 Will you please examine defense document 1030, 18 which is being handed to you, and state whether that 19 document is your affidavit, bearing your signature and 20 21 seal. 22 Yes, this is mine. A 23 Are the contents thereof true and correct? G

MR. BLAKENEY: I offer in evidence the affi-

24

25

Yes.

davit, defense document No. 1030.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1030

will receive exhibit No. 2963.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit 2963 and received in evidence.)

MR. BLAKENEY: I read the affidavit, which, omitting the formal parts, is as follows:

"1. I was the private secretary to the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal from June 1936 to November 1945.

an official of the Foreign Ministry, in the morning of 7 December 1941 at the Imperial Household Ministry. He told me that the Foreign Ministry had received a telegram from Washington reporting that a personal telegram had been dispatched from the American President to the Emperor, and asked me if the telegram had been delivered directly to the Imperial Household Ministry. I told him, however, that the Imperial Household Ministry had not received such a telegram.

"On the same day about 8:30 p. m. when I was at my private residence, Mr. KASE telephoned and asked me again about the above-mentioned private telegram from American President. Thereupon, I immediately in-

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

davit, defense document No. 1030.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1030 will receive exhibit No. 2963.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit 2963 and received in evidence.)

MR. BLAKENEY: I read the affidavit, which, omitting the formal parts, is as follows:

"1. I was the private secretary to the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal from June 1936 to November 1945.

"2. I received a telephone call from Mr. KASE, an official of the Foreign Ministry, in the morning of 7 December 1941 at the Imperial Household Ministry. He told me that the Foreign Vinistry had received a telegram from Washington reporting that a personal telegram had been dispatched from the American President to the Emperor, and asked me if the telegram had been delivered directly to the Imperial Household Ministry. I told him, however, that the Imperial Household Ministry had not received such a telegram.

"On the same day about 8:30 p. m. when I was at my private residence, Mr. KASE telephoned and asked me again about the above-mentioned private telegram from American President. Thereupon, I immediately in-

22 23 24

davit, defense document No. 1030.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1030

will receive exhibit No. 2963.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit 2963 and received in evidence.)

MR. BLAKENEY: I read the affidavit, which, omitting the formal parts, is as follows:

"1. I was the private secretary to the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal from June 1936 to November 1945.

"2. I received a telephone call from Mr. KASE, an official of the Foreign Ministry, in the morning of 7 December 1941 at the Imperial Household Ministry. He told me that the Foreign Ministry had received a telegram from Washington reporting that a personal telegram had been dispatched from the American President to the Emperor, end asked me if the telegram had been delivered directly to the Imperial Household Ministry. I told him, however, that the Imperial Household Ministry had not received such a telegram.

"On the same day about 8:30 p. m. when I was at my private residence, Mr. KASE telephoned and asked me again about the above-mentioned private telegram from American President. Thereupon, I immediately in-

4 5

quired of the office of the Chamberlain (Jijushoku) and of the officer on duty in the Ministry about the matter, and informed him (Mr. KASE) that the Ministry had received no such telegram as yet.

"Later on, after 12 o'clock of the same night, Mr. KASE called me by phone and informed me that the American Ambassador in Tokyo had conveyed the telegram of the President to the Foreign Minister."

You may cross-examine.

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, there will be no cross-examination.

FR. BLAKENEY: I ask that the witness be excused on the usual terms.

THE PRESIDENT: He is excused accordingly.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

we will adjourn now until half-past nine to-

(Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment was taken until Tuesday, 19 August, 1947, at 0930.)

20

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21 22

23 24